

A
VINDICATION
OF THE
DOCTRINE
OF THE
Holy and Ever Blessed TRINITY,
AND THE
INCARNATION
OF
The Son of God.

OCCASIONED

By the Brief NOTES on the Creed of
St. *Athanasius*, and the Brief HISTORY
of the *Unitarians*, or *Socinians*, and
containing an Answer to both.

By **WILLIAM SHERLOCK, D. D.**
Master of the TEMPLE.

The Second Edition.

IMPRIMATUR,

Jan. 9. 1690.

Z. Iſham, R. P. D.^h Henrico
Episc. Lond. à Sacris.

LONDON:

Printed for **W. Rogers**, at the *Sun* over against St.
Dunſons Church in *Fleet-street*. 1691.

ALPHABET

BOOK

The Son of

of the

of the

of the

of the

of the

of the

of the

T O T H E
R E A D E R.

I Will make no Apology for publishing this Vindication of the Great and Fundamental Mysteries of our Religion, for if ever it were necessary, it is now, when Atheists and Hereticks, some openly, some under a disguise, conspire together to ridicule the Trinity, and the Incarnation.

I confess, the Book is too big, could I have made it less, as at first I intended; but when I was once engaged, I saw a necessity of going farther; and I hope no man will have reason to complain, that I have said too much, but those, who will find a great deal too much said, for them to answer.

My Original Design was to vindicate the Doctrines of the Trinity and Incarnation, from those pretended Absurdities and Contradictions, which were so confidently charged on them; and this I'm sure I have done; for I have given a very easie and intelligible Notion of a Trinity in Unity, and if it be possible to explain this Doctrine intelligibly, the Charge of Contradictions vanishes; and whether men will believe this Account or not, they can't deny, but that it is very possible and intelligible, and if we could go no farther, that is enough in Matters of Revelation.

But I hope, I have done a great deal more than this,

The PREFACE.

and proved, That it is the true Scripture Account of it, and agreeable to the Doctrine of the Ancient Fathers ; and have vindicated the Scripture Proofs of a Trinity and Incarnation from the pitiful Sophistries of the late Socinian Historian.

I have not indeed answered particularly the whole Book in Order and Method, as it lies , which was too tedious a Work, and not necessary ; but I have considered whatever was most material in it, and have avoided nothing, because it was hard to. Answer, but because it needed no Answer, as I am ready to satisfy the World, whenever a just Occasion calls for it : for having dipt my Pen in the Vindication of so glorious a Cause, by the Grace of God, I will never desert it, while I can hold a Pen in my Hand.

I must thankfully own, that the writing of this Book has given me clearer and more distinct Notions of this Great Mystery, then I had before, which is the Reason, why the Reader will find some things explained towards the end, which I spoke doubtfully of at first, as particularly the difference between the Eternal Generation of the Son, and the Procession of the Holy Ghost ; and I hope this is a pardonable Fault.

The writing this Book has cost me many Thoughts, and those who have a mind thoroughly to understand it, must not think much if it cost them some ; and if they cannot be contented to bestow some serious Thoughts on it, it will be lost labour to read it. I pray God give success to it, and open the Eyes of those Men, before it be too late, who are so industrious to write or disperse such Brief Notes and Brief Histories, as are valuable for nothing but Blasphemy and Nonsense ; for I will be bold to say, That Socinianism (after all its pretences to Reason) is one of the most stupid senseless Heresies, that ever infested the Christian Church.

THE

THE CONTENTS.

SECT. I. Concerning the Nature of a Contradiction, and how to know it.	page 1.
Many Contradictions pretended, where there are none, as in the Notion of a Spirit, and of God	3
How to discover when a pretended Contradiction is not real, but in our imperfect Conception of things.	4
It is absurd to dispute against the Being of any thing from the difficulty of conceiving it.	5
What the natural Boundaries of Humane Knowledge are.	9
SECT. II. The Athanasian Creed contains nothing but what is necessary to the true Belief of the Trinity and Incarnation.	10
The Dispute between the Greek and Lat. Church, about the filioque.	17
SECT. III. Concerning the necessity of the Catholick Faith to Salvation, and a Brief History of Athanasius.	21
That the Catholick Faith is necessary to Salvation.	25
What is meant by keeping the Catholick Faith whole and undefiled.	28
The Scriptures being a compleat Rule of Faith, do not make Athanasius's Creed an unnecessary Rule.	29
The great usefulness of ancient Creeds.	31
Pope Leo III. would not deny Salvation to those who disowned the filioque.	33
What is meant by the Catholick Faith.	35
The History of Athanasius.	37
SECT. IV. The Catholick Doctrine of a Trinity in Unity, and Unity and Trinity, explained, and vindicated from all pretended Absurdities and Contradictions.	45
What it is that makes any Substance numerically One.	48
The Unity of a Spirit nothing else but Self-consciousness.	ibid.
And therefore mutual consciousness makes Three Persons essentially and numerically One.	49
The unity of a Mind or Spirit reaches as far as its Self-consciousness does.	50
That this is the true Scripture Notion of the Unity of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.	ibid.
	The

The CONTENTS.

<i>The Unity between Father and Son explained.</i>	51
<i>The union of created Spirits, an union in Knowledge, Will and Love.</i>	52
<i>The same union between Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.</i>	ibid.
<i>But this, which is only a moral union between Creatures, is an essential union between Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, as it is the effect of mutual Consciousness.</i>	55
<i>This proved from Scripture, as to the unity between Father and Son.</i>	56
<i>This makes all Three Divine Persons coessential and coequal.</i>	58
<i>That the Holy Spirit is One with Father and Son by a mutual Consciousness, proved from Scripture.</i>	64
<i>This Notion contains the true Orthodox Faith of a Trinity in Unity.</i>	66
<i>For it does not confound the Persons, but makes them distinct.</i>	ibid.
<i>Nor divide the Substance, but makes them numerically One.</i>	68
<i>This makes the Doctrine of the Trinity as intelligible as the Notion of One God.</i>	ibid.
<i>The material Images of Substance confound our Notions, both of One God, and of a Trinity in Unity.</i>	69
<i>God must be considered as Eternal Truth and Wisdom.</i>	70
<i>Wisdom and Truth a pure and simple Act, and contains all Divine Perfections.</i>	71
<i>Three infinite Minds must necessarily be mutually conscious to each other.</i>	74
<i>No positive Notion of Infinity, but only in a Mind.</i>	75
<i>No infinite Extension.</i>	76
<i>What the true Notion of Infinite is, that it is absolute Perfection.</i>	78
<i>That there are no absolute Perfections, but those of a Mind.</i>	79
<i>Extension is no Perfection, nor to be Omnipresent by Extension.</i>	80
<i>The same absolute Perfections of a Mind, by a mutual Consciousness, may be entire and equal in Three infinite Minds.</i>	81
<i>This reconciles the perfect equality and subordination of the Divine Persons.</i>	ibid.
<i>And shows, how each Person is God, and all but one God.</i>	82
<i>This gives an Account of the different modi subsistendi, of which the Schools speak.</i>	83
<i>And how the Operations of the Trinity ad extra are common to all Three Persons.</i>	85
<i>An Answer to the Absurdities and Contradictions charged on the Doctrine of the Trinity by the Brief Notes.</i>	87
S E C T. V. The Doctrine of the Fathers and Schools about a Trinity	

The CONTENTS.

<i>ry in Unity, reconciled to the foregoing Explication of it.</i>	page 100
<i>That the Fathers made the Three Divine Persons Three distinct infinite Minds</i>	101
<i>That Father, Son, and Holy Ghost are as distinct Persons, as Peter, James, and John, how to be understood.</i>	104
<i>How the Fathers Explain the Unity of the Godhead.</i>	105
<i>1. By the <i>μονομερία</i> or coessentiality of the Divine Persons.</i>	106
<i>What they meant by the <i>μονομερία</i>.</i>	ibid.
<i>How they proved the Unity of Essence from the sameness of Nature.</i>	
<i>Gregory Nyssen's reasoning in this matter, and vindicated from the Misrepresentation of Petavius and Dr. Cudworth.</i>	109.&c.
<i>2. To this the Fathers added a Numerical Unity of the Divine Essence.</i>	121
<i>Concerning the Unity of Energy and Power.</i>	123
<i>The <i>αὐτογνωσία</i> or Circumcession is Self-consciousness.</i>	125
<i>St. Austin explains the Unity of the Divine Persons by Examples of Self-consciousness.</i>	126
<i>The Unity of the Godhead consists in the Unity of Principle.</i>	128
<i>How the Three Divine Persons, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost are essential to the Notion of One God, explained at large.</i>	129.&c.
SECT. VI. <i>Concerning expounding Scripture by Reason.</i>	140
<i>The Arguments against a Trinity in the History of the Unitarians, Letter 1. particularly answered.</i>	153, &c.
<i>His first Argument.</i>	154
<i>His second Argument.</i>	155
<i>1 Coloss. 17. The first-born of every Creature explained.</i>	156
<i>The Mediator Kingdom of Christ explained at large.</i>	159
<i>His third, fourth, and fifth Arguments answered.</i>	176
<i>His sixth Argument.</i>	178
<i>His seventh Argument.</i>	184
<i>His eighth Argument from those Texts, which declare that the Father only is God.</i>	ibid.
<i>His ninth Argument, That if Christ were God, there was no need of giving the Holy Spirit to his Human Nature.</i>	187
<i>His tenth and eleventh Arguments.</i>	188
<i>His Arguments against the Godhead of the Holy Ghost.</i>	ibid.
<i>Concerning the Personality of the Holy Ghost.</i>	189
<i>That the Spirit is obtained of God by our Prayers, therefore if self is not God, Answered.</i>	193
<i>Father,</i>	

The CONTENTS.

<i>Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, the entire Object of Worship.</i>	page 193
<i>Those who do not worship the Trinity, do not worship the true God, if Father, Son, and Holy Ghost be God.</i>	194
<i>No need of any new Command to worship the Holy Ghost, when it is revealed, that he is One God with the Father and Son.</i>	ibid.
<i>That the Scripture speaks of God as One Person, Answered.</i>	196
<i>Whether the Socinian Faith be a reasonable and accountable Faith.</i>	198
<i>The Socinian Faith ridicules the Scriptures.</i>	199
<i>This is particularly shown in the Expositions of Scripture, contained in the History of the Unitarians.</i>	ibid.
<i>The Form of Baptism in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, explained.</i>	209
<i>1 John 1, 2. In the beginning was the Word, &c. explained and vindicated.</i>	215
<i>How this Historian has represented Grotius.</i>	220
<i>Socinianism makes the Jewish economy very unreasonable and unaccountable.</i>	231
<i>Socinianism ridicules the Christian Religion.</i>	238
SECT. VII. An Answer to what remains in the Brief Notes.	256
<i>Concerning the Generation of the Son.</i>	ibid.
<i>The equality and coeternity of the Persons in the Trinity.</i>	259
<i>Concerning the Incarnation.</i>	262
<i>How an infinite and finite Being may be united into one Person.</i>	263
<i>What makes a Personal Union.</i>	266

A
VINDICATION
Of the DOCTRINE

OF THE
Holy and Ever Blessed TRINITY,

AND OF THE
Incarnation of the SON of GOD,
In ANSWER to the Brief NOTES
on the Creed of St. *Athanasius.*

SECT. I.
*Concerning the Nature of a Contradiction, and
how to know it.*

BEFORE I particularly Examine the *Brief
Notes on Athanasius's Creed*, which under a
pretence of exposing that Creed, charge the
Christian Faith itself of *Three Persons and One God*,
with the most monstrous Absurdities and Contradi-
ctions: I shall, 1. Shew what a Contradiction is,
and in what cases we can judge of a Contradiction.
2. I shall take a brief view of the *Athanasian Creed*,

B

and

A Vindication of the Doctrine of the

and shew that it signifies no more than that there are Three Persons and One God, or a Trinity in Unity, and Unity in Trinity ; and that if we own this, we must own the particular Explications of the *Athanasian* Creed.

First, As for the first : A Contradiction is to deny and affirm the same thing in the same sense ; as to say, that a thing is, and is not at the same time ; that there is but One God, and that there is Three Gods ; that is, that there is, and that there is not, but One God ; for if there be Three Gods, then it is not true that there is only One God : Things which are so contrary as to contradict each other, can never be both true, for all Contradictions finally resolve into this : It is, and It is not ; which is absolutely impossible.

But when we come to apply this to the nature of Things, we may easily fancy Contradictions where there are none : For a Contradiction in the nature of Things, is such a Notion or Idea of any thing as implies a Contradiction ; and then it is impossible any such thing can be, as it is impossible, that such a Proposition whose terms contradict each other should be true : but then before we can pronounce, that such a Notion or Idea is contradictory, we must be sure, that we perfectly understand and comprehend the nature of that Being, otherwise the Contradiction may not be in the thing, but in our manner of conceiving it : It is not enough in this case to say, we cannot understand it, and know not how to reconcile it ; but we must say, that we do perfectly understand it, and know that it cannot be reconciled.

As

Holy and Ever Blessed TRINITY.

3

As for instance: Some new Philosophers will tell you, that the Notion of a Spirit, or an immaterial Substance is a Contradiction, for by Substance they understand nothing but Matter, and then an immaterial Substance is immaterial Matter, that is, Matter and no Matter, which is a Contradiction: but yet this does not prove an immaterial Substance to be a Contradiction, unless they could first prove, that there is no Substance, but Matter; and that they cannot conceive any other Substance but Matter, does not prove, that there is no other.

Thus the Atheist discovers a great many Contradictions or Absurdities in the very Notion and Idea of a God, or of an *Eternal, Omnipresent, Omnipotent, Omniscient Being*. For to be without a cause, and without a beginning, without time, and without succession; to be present every-where, and to fill all Places, and yet to have no parts, no extension; to be able to create a World, and to annihilate it again, to make all things of nothing, and to reduce all things to nothing again; to know all things, past, present, and to come, especially the most contingent Futurities, the freest Thoughts and Counsels of Men, before they think them, or some Ages before they themselves are in being, without imposing a Fatal Necessity on Humane Actions; I say, the Notion of such a Being is very much above our conception, and to an Atheist, who is for believing nothing, but what he can fully comprehend, seems very absurd and contradictory.

This shews, that Men may easily mistake in charging the Nature and Notions of Things with Contradictions, and therefore we must enquire, how we may discover, when such an appearing Contradiction

A Vindication of the Doctrine of the

is not real, but is wholly owing to our imperfect conception of things.

I. Now in the first place we have great reason to suspect this, when it relates to such things as all Mankind agree, we do not, and cannot fully understand or comprehend; for it is a vain and arrogant presumption to say what is, or what is not a Contradiction, when we confess, we do not understand or comprehend the thing we speak of: A Contradiction in the Nature of Things, is what is contrary to the Nature of that Being of which we speak: Now so far as we understand the Nature of any Being, we can certainly tell what is contrary and contradictory to its Nature: As that Accidents should subsist without their subject, that a Body should be without extension, or an organized Body without any distinction of parts; that the same individual Body should be in Heaven and on Earth, and in a thousand distant places at the same time; that Flesh and Blood should lie invisible under the Species of Bread and Wine; that a Body, suppose of five or six foot long, should be concealed under the least crum of Bread; these and such like are the manifest Absurdities and Contradictions of Transubstantiation; and we know that they are so, because we know the Nature of a Body, and know that such things are a contradiction to the essential Properties of a Body: But now all Men must confess, that they have not a clear and comprehensive Notion of the Nature and Essential Properties of a Spirit, especially of an infinite Spirit, as God is; and it is impossible to know, what is contrary to the Nature of a Spirit, if we know not, what the Nature of a Spirit is; and that Man, who shall pretend to comprehend all that is possible in an infinite Nature, is as contemptibly

Holy and Ever Blessed TRINITY.

5

temptibly ridiculous, as if he should challenge to himself infinite Knowledge, for without that, no Man can comprehend what is infinite.

II. It is a sufficient proof, that such seeming Contradictions are not in the nature of things, but in our imperfect manner of conceiving them, when we have other evident proofs, that the thing is, though we cannot comprehend it : for nothing can be, which involves a Contradiction in its nature, and therefore if it is, the contradiction is not real, but imaginary.

As for instance : As unconceivable as the Notion of Eternity is, yet all Mankind, even Atheists themselves, must confess, that something was from Eternity ; for if ever there was nothing, it is impossible there ever should have been any thing ; for that which once was not, can never be without a cause, and therefore whatever Difficulties there may be in the Notion of an Eternal Being, we must acknowledge something Eternal, and that is proof enough, that there is nothing absurd or contradictory in the Notion, though we cannot comprehend it ; and I am sure the Notion of a first Eternal Cause, is much more easie and natural, than to make either Matter, or the World and all the Creatures in it Eternal. Whatever we can certainly prove to be, either by Sense, Reason, or Revelation, if there be any difficulty in conceiving it, we must attribute that to the imperfection of our own Knowledge, not to any Absurdity or Contradiction in the thing itself.

This shewshew unreasonable that Method is, which is taken by Atheists, Infidels, and Hereticks, to dispute against the being of any thing from the difficulty of conceiving it, and some pretended Absurdities and Contradictions in it, when there are very plain

A Vindication of the Doctrine of the

plain proofs that the thing is, and such as it is impossible for them fairly to answer ; this is the fundamental miscarriage, which is not owing to a prudent caution, as is pretended, but to wilfulness and obstinacy, and pride of Understanding, or to a fixed prejudice and aversion to the belief of such matters, and therefore I shall not only observe, but particularly prove the unreasonableness of it.

The proof of this comes to this one point, that we may have sufficient evidence of the being of a thing, whose nature we cannot conceive and comprehend ; he who will not own this, contradicts the sense and experience of Mankind ; and he who confesses this, and yet rejects the belief of that, which he has good evidence for, meerly because he cannot conceive it, is a very absurd and senseless Infidel.

And the reason of this is very plain, because all the ways whereby the being of any thing can be proved, are obvious and intelligible to all Mankind, but the nature of most things are very dark and obscure, and such as the wisest Men know little or nothing of : And therefore we may certainly know, that a great many things are, whose nature and essential properties we cannot conceive : As to shew this particularly.

1. The proofs that any thing is, are either from Sense, from Reason, or from Revelation. What is evident to Sense, is evident to all Men, who have their Senses ; what is plainly proved by Reason (and it is not a sufficient proof, if it be not plain) is plain to all Men, who can use their Reason ; and what is plainly revealed every Man may know, who can read and understand the Scriptures ; the being and nature of things are known very different ways, and
the

Holy and Ever Blessed TRINITY.

the being of things not only may, but most commonly is known without knowing their natures : Any Man may know the first, but few Men in any measure can know the second : Whoever has his Senses about him, knows that there are such things, as he sees, hears, or feels, but the Philosophy of Nature is not learnt by Sense : Reason will convince us by some visible and sensible effects, that there are some invisible causes, without informing us distinctly, what the nature and powers of such causes are ; and God may and does reveal many things to us, which we either are not capable of fully comprehending, or the nature of which he does not think fit particularly to explain to us ; and in all these cases we may certainly know, that things are, without understanding the Nature and Philosophy of them.

2. It is so far from being a wonder to meet with any thing, whose nature we do not perfectly understand, that I know nothing in the World, which we do perfectly understand : It is agreed by all Men, whoever considered this matter, that the essences of things cannot be known, but only their properties and qualities : The World is divided into Matter, and Spirit, and we know no more, what the substance of Matter, than what the substance of a Spirit is, though we think we know one, much better than the other : We know thus much of Matter, that it is an extended substance, which fills a space, and has distinct parts, which may be separated from each other, that it is susceptible of very different qualities, that it is hot or cold, hard or soft, &c. but what the substance of Matter is, we know not : And thus we know the essential properties of a Spirit ; that it is a thinking substance, with the Faculties of Understanding and Will,

A Vindication of the Doctrine of the

Will, and is capable of different Vertues or Vices, as Matter is of sensible qualities, but what the substance of a Spirit is, we know no more than what the substance of matter is :

Thus as for the essential properties, operations, and powers, of Matter, Sense, Experience, and Observation will tell us what they are, and what causes constantly produce such effects, and this is all we do, or can know of it ; and he who will not believe that Matter is extended, that the Fire burns, that Water may be condensed by Frost into a firm and solid Pavement, that Seed sown in the Earth will produce its own kind again, that a Body can move from one place to another ; that a Stone falls to the ground, and Vapours ascend and thicken into Clouds, and fall down again to the Earth in gentle Showers, &c. I say, he who will not believe these things till he can give a Philosophical account of them, must deny his Senses in complement to his Understanding ; and he who thinks, that he does understand these matters, would make a Man question, whether he has any Sense.

Thus it is also with reference to a Spirit : We feel within ourselves, that we can think and reason, that we can choose and refuse, that we can love and hate, and desire and fear, but what these natural powers and passions are, we know not ; how thoughts rise in our minds, and how one thought begets another ; how a thought can move our Bodies, or fix them in their Seat ; how the Body can raise thoughts and passions in the Soul, or the thoughts and passions of the Soul can affect the Body : The Properties and Operations both of Bodies and Spirits are great Secrets and Mysteries in Nature, which we understand nothing

nothing of, nor are concerned to understand them, no more than it is our business to understand, how to make either a Body or a Spirit; which we have no power to do, if we did understand it, and therefore it would be an useleſs piece of Knowledge, which would ſerve no end but Curioſity; and that is reaſon enough why our wiſe Maker ſhould not communicate this knowledge to us, were we capable of it, becauſe it does not belong to our Natures; as no Knowledge does which we can make no uſe of: the perfect Notions and Idea's of Things are proper only to that Almighty Mind, which can give being to them.

Now this plainly ſhews, what the Natural Boundaries of Humane Knowledge are; how far we may attain to a certain Knowledge, and where we muſt give off our Enquiries, unleſs we have a mind to impoſe upon our Underſtandings with ſome uncertain and fanciful Conjectures, or to perplex our ſelves with inexplicable Difficulties.

1. As firſt, We have certain ways of diſcovering the being of Things, which fall within the compaſs of our Knowledge; this our Senſes, Reaſon, or Revelation, will acquaint us with, and therefore we may know what Things there are in the World, as far as they fall under the notice of Senſe, or are diſcovered by Reaſon or Revelation.

2. We may know what Things are, or what their eſſential Properties, Qualities, Operations, and Powers are, whereby we can diſtinguiſh one ſort of Beings from another; as ſuppoſe, a Body from a Spirit, Bread from Fleſh, and Wine from Blood; and can Reaſon from Effects to Cauſes, and from Cauſes to Effects, with as great certainty as we underſtand, what the Cauſes or Effects are.

C

3. But

A Vindication of the Doctrine of the

3. But the Essences of Things, and the Philosophy of their Natures, the Reasons of their Essential Properties and Powers, which immediately result from their Natures, the manner of their Production, and the manner of their Operations, are Mysteries to us, and will be so, do what we can; and therefore here our Enquiries must cease, if we enquire wisely; for it is vain and absurd to perplex ourselves with such Questions, which we can no more answer, than we can make a World.

The sum is this, when we charge any Doctrine with Absurdities and Contradictions, we must be sure, that we understand the thing; for if it be such a thing, as we do not, and cannot understand the Nature of, we may imagine a thousand Absurdities and Contradictions, which are owing wholly to our Ignorance of Things.

S E C T. II.

The Athanasian Creed contains nothing but what is necessary to the true belief of the Trinity and Incarnation.

II. **L**ET us now take a view of the *Athanasian Creed*, which this prophane Author makes the Subject of his Drollery and Ridicule; and examine, whether there be any thing in it, which a good Catholick Christian can reject, without rejecting the Catholick Doctrines of the Holy and Ever Blessed TRINITY, and the Mysterious Incarnation of the SON of GOD; for if this Creed contains nothing but what is necessary to this belief, and what every Christian who believes these Doctrines must profess, then all these Scoffs, which are cast upon the *Athanasian Creed*, do indeed

Holy and Ever-Blessed TRINITY.

indeed belong to the Christian Faith itself, if the Trinity and Incarnation be Christian Doctrines.

As to begin with the Doctrine of the Holy Trinity. The *Athanasian Creed* tells us: *The Catholick Faith is this, that we worship One God in Trinity, and Trinity in Unity*: that is, that we worship One God, and Three Persons, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; and this all Christians grant to be the Catholick Faith, except *Arians, Macedonians, and Socinians*, and such like Hereticks: And how we must worship one God in Trinity, and Trinity in Unity, is explained in the next Paragraph.

Neither confounding the Persons, nor dividing the Substance.

Which must be acknowledged, if there be Three Persons and One God: for if we confound the Persons, by saying, that they are all but One Person under Three different Names and Titles, or Denominations, then we destroy the Distinction of Persons; if we divide the Substance, by saying, that every Person has a separate Divine Nature of his own, as every Man has a separate Humane Nature, then we make Three Gods, as *Peter, James, and John*, are Three Men, which is to overthrow the Doctrine of One God; and therefore the Creed adds,

For there is One Person of the Father, another of the Son, and another of the Holy Ghost.

But the God-head of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost is all One; the Glory equal, the Majesty co-eternal.

This is so far from being a Nicity, that it is no less than a Demonstration, if we confess Three Persons and One God; for if there be Three Persons, then the Person of the Father, the Person of the Son, the Person of the Holy Ghost, must be distinct Persons, or they cannot be Three; if there be but One God, then the Godhead of all the Three Persons is but One, for if the Godhead were more than One, there must be more than One God; for the Godhead makes the God, and there must be as many Gods, as there are Godheads, as there must be as many Men as there are particular Humane Natures: And if the Godhead be but One, then with respect to the same One Godhead, all Three Persons must have the same Glory and Majesty; for there cannot be Three different Glories and Majesties of the same One Godhead; and therefore as it follows:

Such as the Father is, such is the Son, and such is the Holy Ghost.

The Father Uncreate, the Son Uncreate, and the Holy Ghost Uncreate.

The Father Incomprehensible, the Son Incomprehensible, the Holy Ghost Incomprehensible.

The Father Eternal, the Son Eternal, and the Holy Ghost Eternal.

And yet they are not Three Eternals, but One Eternal.

As also there are not Three Incomprehensibles, nor Three Uncreated; but One Uncreated, and One Incomprehensible.

So likewise the Father is Almighty, the Son Almighty, and the Holy Ghost Almighty.

And

Holy and Ever Blessed TRINITY

13

And yet there are not Three Almighty's, but One Almighty.

So the Father is God, the Son is God, and the Holy Ghost is God.

And yet there are not Three Gods, but One God.

So likewise the Father is Lord, the Son Lord, and the Holy Ghost Lord.

And yet not Three Lords, but One Lord.

For like as we are compelled by the Christian Verity, to acknowledge every Person by himself to be God and Lord.

So are we forbidden by the Catholick Religion, to say, there are Three Gods, or Three Lords.

This is the sum of all, that as the Catholick Religion, both Natural, Mosaical, and Christian, requires us to believe, that there is but One God, so especially the Christian Religion teaches us, that there are Three Divine Persons, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, who are this One God. Now if each Person with respect to the same Divine Nature be God, then all the essential Attributes and Perfections of a God must be allowed to each Person; that he is Uncreated, Infinite, or Incomprehensible, Eternal, Almighty God and Lord; unless we will say, that there may be a Created, Finite, Temporal, Impotent God; that is, a God, who is not in truth either God or Lord; and yet though we must acknowledge each Person to be God and Lord, we must not assert Three distinct Uncreated; Incomprehensible, Eternal, Almighty Gods (which is the true sense of the Article, of which more anon) for that is to make not One, but Three Gods and Lords, which overthrows the Unity of the Godhead.

Now

Now whatever difficulty there may be in conceiving this (which I do not now dispute) if that be any fault, it is no fault of the *Athanasian* Creed, but of the Doctrine of the Trinity itself; the *Athanasian* Creed only tells us what we must believe, if we believe a Trinity in Unity, Three Persons and One God: And I challenge any Man, who sincerely professes this Faith, to tell me, what he can leave out of this Exposition, without destroying either the Divinity of some of the Three Persons, or the Unity of the Godhead. If each Person must be God and Lord, must not each Person be Uncreated, Incomprehensible, Eternal, Almighty? If there be but One God, and One Lord, can there be Three separated Uncreated, Incomprehensible, Eternal, Almighty Gods! which must of necessity be Three Gods, and Three Lords: This Creed does not pretend to explain, how there are Three Persons, each of which is God, and yet but one God, (of which more hereafter) but only asserts the Thing, that thus it is, and thus it must be, if we believe a Trinity in Unity; which should make all Men, who would be thought neither *Arians*, nor *Socinians*, more cautious how they express the least dislike of the *Athanasian* Creed, which must either argue, that they condemn it, before they understand it, or that they have some secret dislike to the Doctrine of the Trinity.

Nor is this to make any additions to the Christian Faith, as some object, no more than to explain what we mean by GOD is an addition to the Faith: This was all the Christian Fathers aimed at in their Disputes against *Arius*, and other Enemies of the Catholick Faith, and in those Creeds they framed in opposition to these Heresies, to assert the true Divinity

of the Son and Holy Spirit in such express terms, as would admit of no evasion: For this reason they insisted so immoveably upon the term *Homo-ousios*, which signifies, that the Son was of the same Nature with the Father, as he must be, if he be true and real God; whereas had he been only like the Father, as the *Arians* asserted, he could not be One God with him; for that which is only *like* something else, is not the same: Now though the term *ὁμοούσιος* is not in Scripture, yet this is no unscriptural addition to the Faith, because all that is signified by it is there; that is, that Christ is the Eternal and Only Begotten Son of God, a true and real, not a made, or created, or nominal God: And the *Athanasian* Creed, as far as it relates to this matter, is only a more particular explication of the *Homo-ousios*, or in what sense the Son is of the same Nature with the Father, and One God with him.

In the next place, the *Athanasian* Creed having very explicitly declared the Unity of the Godhead in Three Persons, it proceeds to the distinct Characters of each Person, and their Unity among themselves; and here also it teaches nothing, but what seems essential to the Distinction and Unity of the Three Divine Persons, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.

The Father is made of none, neither created nor begotten.

The Son is of the Father alone, not made, nor created, but begotten.

The Holy Ghost is of the Father, and of the Son, neither made, nor created, nor begotten, but proceeding.

So

A Vindication of the Doctrine of the

So there is One Father, not Three Fathers, One Son, not Three Sons, One Holy Ghost, not Three Holy Ghosts.

The Distinction then between these Three Divine Persons, (if I may so speak) is in the manner of their Subsistence: That the Father is *æternus*, God of Himself, the Original Fountain of the Deity, *not made, nor created*, for then he would be a Creature, not a God; *nor begotten*, for then he would be a Son, not the first Father and Origine of all.

The Son is of the Father alone, which is essential to his being a Son; *not made, nor created*, for there was no time, when he was not, as all things made or created must have a beginning, *but begotten*; which is the proper term, whereby we express Generation, and whereby the eternal Generation of the Son is expressed in Scripture: What it signifies we know not any further than this, that it is the Eternal communication of the Nature and Image of the Father to him; as an earthly Parent communicates his own Nature and Likeness to his Son.

The Holy Ghost is of the Father and of the Son, not made, nor created, for no Creature, *not begotten*, for no Son; *but proceeding*, *ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ*, the manner of which we understand no more, than the manner of the Eternal Generation; but there is this plain difference between being begotten and proceeding, that though the Holy Spirit have the same Nature with the Father and the Son, yet he represents the Person of neither, as the Son does the Person of the Father, as *being the brightness of his Father's Glory, and the express Image of his Person*: and therefore is said not to be begotten, but to proceed.

But

But the difficulty of this is with reference to the Dispute between the *Greek* and *Latin* Church about the *Filioque*, or the Spirits proceeding from the Father and from the Son: the reason why the *Latin* Church insists on this, is to preserve the Unity and Subordination of the Divine Persons to each other: The Son is united and subordinate to the Father, as begotten by him: The Holy Ghost is united and subordinate to Father and Son, as proceeding both from the Father and from the Son; but if the Holy Spirit proceeded only from the Father, not from the Son, there would be no Union and Subordination between the Son and the Spirit, and yet the Spirit is the Spirit of the Son, as well as of the Father, and that these Three Persons be One God, it is necessary, there should be an Union of Persons, as well as One Nature: But then the *Greek* Church confesses, That the Spirit proceedeth from the Father *by* the Son, though not *from* the Son; and *by* and *from* are such Niceties, when we confess, we understand not the manner of this Procession of the Holy Spirit as ought to have made no Dispute, much less a Schism between the two Churches: The *Greek* Church acknowledges the Distinction of Persons, and their Unity and Subordination; That *there is One Father, not Three Fathers, One Son, not Three Sons, One Holy Ghost, not Three Holy Ghosts; that the Unity in Trinity, and the Trinity in Unity is to be worshipped;* which is all this Creed requires as necessary to Salvation: He therefore, that will be saved, must thus think of the Trinity: that is, must acknowledge and worship a Trinity in Unity, and Unity in Trinity; which the *Greek* Church does, and therefore are not excluded from Salvation in this Creed upon the

*A Vindication of the Doctrine of the
nice Dispute of the Spirit's proceeding from or by the
Son.*

That which seems to sound harshest in this Creed
is what follows:

*And in this Trinity, none is afore or after other,
none is greater, or less than another.*

*But the whole Three Persons are co-eternal and co-
equal.*

And yet this we must acknowledge to be true, if
we acknowledge all Three Persons to be Eternal, for
in Eternity there can be no *afore*, or *after other* ;
and that we cannot conceive an Eternal Generation or
Procession, is no great wonder, when we cannot con-
ceive an Eternal being, without any beginning or any
cause : As for greater or less, and the equality of
Three Persons, this we must confess also, if we be-
lieve all Three Persons to be one Supream and So-
veraign God ; for in one Supream Deity, there can-
not be greater or less ; but then we must distinguish
between Subordination and Equality : Persons who
are equal may be subordinate to each other ; and
though there be not a greater or less, yet there is
Order in the Trinity : Equality is owing to Nature,
Subordination to Relation and Order, which is indeed
a greater and less in Relation and Order without an in-
equality of Nature, and it is the Equality of Persons
with respect to their Nature, not to their Order and
Subordination, of which the Creed speaks ; for in this
sense the Father is greater than the Son, and the Fa-
ther and the Son than the Holy Spirit, as being first
in Order, but their Nature is the same, and their Per-
sons with respect to this same Nature co-equal.

And

Holy and ever Blessed TRINITY.

19

And now I see no reason to make such Exclamations, as some Men do, against that damnatory Sentence, *That except every One do keep this Faith whole and undefiled, without doubt he shall perish everlastingly*, and that *he that will be saved must thus think of the Trinity*; which refers to no more than the belief of Three Persons and One God, or a Trinity in Unity, and Unity in Trinity, which I take to be the true Christian Faith, and as necessary to Salvation as any part of the Christian Faith is; but of this more anon.

Thus much for the Doctrine of the Trinity; as for the Doctrine of the Incarnation, no Man can reasonably except against that Explication, which is given of it in the *Athanasian Creed*, without rejecting the Doctrine it self, and then we may as well part with the Doctrine of the Incarnation, as with the *Athanasian Creed*. As to shew this particularly:

For the right Faith is, that we believe and confess, that our Lord Jesus Christ the Son of God, is God and Man: for otherwise the Son of God is not Incarnate, has not taken Humane Nature upon him.

God of the Substance of the Father, begotten before the Worlds: as he must be, if he be God: *Man of the Substance of his Mother, born in the World*; for he could not be true Man, if he did not partake of Humane Flesh and Blood.

Perfect God and perfect Man; for otherwise he were neither God, nor Man: *of a reasonable Soul, and humane Flesh subsisting*: for a perfect Man consists of Soul and Body, and unless he have both, he is not a Man; in opposition to those Hereticks, who thought that the Divine Nature animated a Humane Body,

instead of a Soul, but that Christ had no humane reasonable Soul, though he had a humane Body, and therefore was no more a Man, than a humane Body without a Soul is a Man, but a God clothed with Flesh and Blood.

Equal to the Father as touching his Godhead; for he is perfect God, of the same Substance with the Father; and inferior to his Father as touching his Manhood: for a Man is inferior to God and therefore inferior to the Father, though united in one Person to the Son.

Who although he be God and Man, yet he is not Two, but One Christ.

One, not by the Conversion of the Godhead into Flesh, but by taking the Manhood into God.

One altogether, not by Confusion of Substance, but by Unity of Person.

For as the reasonable Soul and Flesh is One Man; so God and Man is One Christ.

All this is necessary to the belief of the Incarnation, that the same Jesus Christ is both God and Man; for if he be but One Christ, he must be God and Man in one Person; for two Persons make two Christs; and if the same One Christ be both God and Man, then the Divine and Humane Nature continue distinct without any mixture or confusion, he is perfect God and perfect Man, in opposition to the Heresies of Nestorius and Eutyches, the first of whom divided the Persons, the second confounded the Natures; the first made God and Man two distinct Persons, and two Christs; the second swallowed up the Humanity in God.

This

Holy and ever Blessed TRINITY.

21

This may serve for a brief Vindication of the *Athanasian Creed*, that it teaches nothing, but what is necessary to the true belief of a Trinity in Unity, and Unity in Trinity, and the Incarnation of the Son of God; and I thought fit to premise this, to let the World see, that all the spight against *Athanasius's Creed*, is not so much intended against that Creed, as against the Doctrine of the Trinity and Incarnation, which are so fenced and guarded from all Heretical Sense and Expositions in that Creed, that there is no place left for Tricks and Evasions: And now I come to consider the Brief Notes, and to expose the Venome and Blasphemy of them, which deserves a sharper Confutation than this: And that this Author may not complain of unfair usage, I shall examine them Paragraph by Paragraph.

SECT. III.

Concerning the Necessity of the Catholick Faith to Salvation, and a brief History of Athanasius.

Whoever will be saved, before all things, 'tis The Creed. necessary, that he hold the Catholick Faith.

"A good Life is of absolute necessity to Salvation; *Brief Notes.*
"but a right belief in these Points, that have been
"always controverted in the Churches of God, "is in
"no degree necessary, much less necessary before all
"things. He that leads a profane and vicious Life,
"sins against a plain acknowledged Rule, and the
"plain and unquestioned Word and Letter of the Di-
"vine Law, and the Dictates of Natural Conscience,
"he wilfully refuses to advert to these Monitors, and
"therefore can no way palliate or excuse his wicked-
"ness:

A Vindication of the Doctrine of the

“ness: But he that errs in a Matter of Faith, after
 “having used *reasonable diligence* to be rightly
 “informed, is in no fault at all: *his Error is pure*
 “*ignorance*; not a culpable Ignorance; For how
 “can it be culpable not to know that, of which a
 “Man is ignorant, after a diligent and impartial En-
 “quiry.

Answer.

This, I must confess, is as artificial an Introduction to these Notes, as could have been invented; for it makes Faith a very useless, and Heresie a very innocent and harmless thing; and then Men need not be much concerned what they believe, if they take care to live well: The Creed affirms, That *the Catholick Faith is before all things necessary to Salvation*; if this be true, then how virtuously soever Men live, they may be damned for Heresie; and this is a dangerous point, and will make Men too much afraid of Heresie to trade in such Notes as these; and therefore this must be confuted in the first place, to take off the dread and fear of Heresie: Now can we hope, that any thing should escape the Censures of such a Critick, who will not allow the Catholick Faith to be necessary to Salvation? For if the Catholick Faith is not necessary, no Faith is, and then we may be saved without Faith; and yet the Scripture tells us, that we are justified and saved by Faith; and if any Faith saves us, I suppose, it must be the Catholick Faith, and then whoever does not hold this *saving Catholick Faith* must be damned. So that at best, he has placed this Note wrong; he should only have opposed the necessity of *Athanasius's Catholick Faith* to Salvation, not of the Catholick Faith in general; and yet this seems not to be a mistake, but design,

design, for his Arguments equally hold against all Faith, as well as against *Athanasius's* Creed, and will serve a *Turk*, a *Jew*, or a *Pagan*, as well as a Heretick. For if what he says is true; *He that errs in a Question of Faith, after having used reasonable diligence to be rightly informed, is in no fault at all:* How comes an Atheist, or an Infidel, a Turk, or a Jew to be in any fault? and if they be good Moral Men [and many of them are, or may be so] why should they be damned for their Atheism or Infidelity, for their not believing a God, or not believing in Christ at all? For are not these Questions of Faith, whether there be a God and a Providence, and whether Christ be that Messias, who came from God? Or does our Author think, that no Atheist or Infidel, no unbelieving Jew, or Heathen, ever used *reasonable diligence* to be rightly informed? Whatever he can say against their *reasonable diligence*, I doubt, will be as easily said against *the reasonable diligence* of Socinians, and other Hereticks.

If you say, he confines this to such *Points as have always been controverted in the Churches of God*, I desire to know a reason, why he thus confines it? For does not his Reason equally extend to the Christian Faith it self, as to those Points, which have been controverted in Christian Churches? And why then should not Infidels as well have the benefit of this Principle, as Hereticks? But I desire to know, what Articles of our Faith have not been controverted by some Hereticks or other? And whether then this does not give sufficient scope to Infidelity, to renounce all the Articles of our Creed, which have been denied or corrupted by some professed Christians?

But

A Vindication of the Doctrine of the

But what he would insinuate in this, that these Points of the *Athanasian* Creed have always been matter of Controversie in the Christian Church, is manifestly false, as appears from all the Records of the Church: The Anti-Nicene Fathers were of the same Faith, before the Definition of the Council of *Nice*, as the Learned Dr. *Ball* has abundantly proved; this was always the Faith of the Christian Church; and those Hereticks, who taught otherwise, either separated themselves from the Church, or were flung out of it; and I hope the Disputes of Hereticks against the Catholick Faith, shall not be called Controversies in the Churches of God.

And yet I desire to know, why that may not be the Catholick Faith, and necessary to Salvation, which has always been matter of Controversie? Has the Catholick Faith any such Priviledge as not to be controverted? Or is it a sufficient proof that nothing is a point of the Catholick Faith, which has been disputed and controverted by some or other in all Ages of the Church? And if Men of perverse Minds may dispute the most necessary Articles of Faith, then if any Faith be necessary, it may be of dangerous consequence to err with our *reasonable diligence* in such necessary and Fundamental Points, as are and have been disputed.

But before I dismiss this Point, it may be convenient to instruct this Author (if he can use any *reasonable diligence* to understand) how necessary it is to Salvation, and that *before all other things*, to hold the true Catholick Faith, and that the Faith of the *Athanasian* Creed is that Catholick Faith which is necessary to Salvation.

1. As for the first of these, I would desire him to consider, that though without Holiness no Man shall see God, yet no Man is saved by his good Works but by Faith in Christ: to say, that we shall be saved by Holiness and good Works without Faith in Christ, is to assert the Merit of good Works ten thousand times more than ever Papists themselves did: The meritorious Works of Popery serve only instead of Penance, to keep them out of Purgatory, or to shorten their time there; they serve instead of that Temporal Punishment, which absolved and penitent Sinners must undergo for those sins, the Eternal Punishment of which is remitted, not for their own meritorious Works, but for the merits and expiation of Christ; but he who expects to be saved for his good Works without Faith in Christ, attributes such a merit to good Works, as redeems him from the Wrath of God, and the Eternal Punishments due to Sin, and purchases Eternal Rewards for him, which is somewhat more than the Church of Rome pretends to; especially since whatever merit they attribute to good Works, they ascribe wholly to the Merits of Christ, whose Merits alone have made our good Works meritorious, which is very honourable to our Saviour, and very Orthodox Divinity, in comparison with those, who think good Works such meritorious things, whatever their Faith be; and if he considers this twice, I suppose, he will confess, that Faith in Christ, the true Catholick Faith, is necessary to Salvation.

2. Nay, it is necessary *before all other things* to our Salvation, because it is necessary to Baptism, which alone puts us into a state of Salvation: For *he that believes and is baptized, shall be saved, but he*

that believes not shall be damned: All Christians must confess, that there is no other Name given under Heaven whereby Men can be saved, but onely the Name of Christ; that Faith in Christ in adult Persons is necessary to Baptism, that Baptism alone incorporates us into the Body of Christ, and puts us into a state of Salvation; and therefore that neither Jews, nor Turks, nor Heathens, none but believing and baptized Christians are in a state of Salvation, how morally vertuous soever their Lives may be: Whoever does not confess this, makes nothing of the Covenant of Grace in Jesus Christ, nothing of his Sacrifice, Priesthood and Intercession; makes the Christian Religion nothing but a new and more perfect Sect of Philosophy, than either Jews or Heathens taught before; whose Condition yet is as safe as the Condition of Christians, if they live according to the knowledge they have: Our Author then must either renounce the Christian Religion, or confess the true Catholick Faith, or a true Faith in Christ, *is before all other things* necessary to Salvation, because this is that which puts us into a state of Salvation by Christ, without which no Man can be saved according to the terms of the Gospel.

3. If Faith in Christ be necessary to Salvation, I suppose, all Men will grant, it must be the true Faith in Christ, not a false and heretical Faith; for that is equivalent to Infidelity; there seems to be little difference between not believing in Christ at all, and not believing what we ought to believe of him, and the belief of which is necessary to Salvation; for if we do not believe that of Christ, which is necessary to Salvation, we may as well believe nothing: and then to be sure it concerns us to hold the Catholick Faith, whatever that be.

4. That

4. That the Faith of the Holy Trinity is that true Christian Faith; which is necessary to Salvation, appears from the Form of Baptism itself; for we are baptised *in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost*: that is, into the Faith and Worship of the Trinity in Unity, and Unity in Trinity, which is the Substance of the *Athanasian Creed*: This is the Baptismal Faith, and that certainly is necessary to Salvation, if any Faith be: Now when we consider, that Baptism is our solemn Dedication to God, and Admission into Covenant with him, to be dedicated to the Son, and Holy Ghost, in the same manner, in the very same act, and same form of words, whereby we are dedicated to the Father, were they not One Supreme and Sovereign God with the Father, would make any considering Man abhor the Christian Religion, as the most open and bare-faced Idolatry, as joyning Creatures with God in the most solemn Act of Religion, that of dedicating Men to His Worship and Service: But not to insist on that now, our Author may hence learn, that to believe in Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, is necessary to Salvation, because it is the Faith of Baptism, and if that Exposition which the *Athanasian Creed* has given of this Faith, be the true Catholick Doctrine, then that is necessary to Salvation; and therefore the Creed begins very properly with asserting the necessity of holding the Catholick Faith, if we will be saved; which must be as necessary to Salvation, as it is to be Christians.

Which Faith except a Man keep whole and undefiled, without doubt he shall perish everlastingly.

Notes.

" By keeping this Faith *whole and undefiled* must
 " be meant, (if any thing be meant) that a Man
 " should believe and profess it, without *adding to it*,
 " or *taking from it* : If we take from it, we do not
 " keep it whole, if we add ought to it, we do not
 " keep it undefiled, and either way we shall perish
 " everlastingly.

Answer.

A Man of ordinary Sense and Candor would have
 said, that to keep this Faith *whole and undefiled*, sig-
 nified not to corrupt the Faith either by *adding to it*,
 or *taking from it* : for whatever we add, or whatever
 we take away, which does not alter the Essentials of
 our Faith, the Faith remains *whole and undefiled* still :
 But this would have spoiled his notable Remarks both
 as to adding and taking away.

Notes.

" First for *adding* : What if an honest plain Man,
 " *because he is a Christian and a Protestant*, should
 " think it necessary to add this Article to the *Atha-*
 " *nasian Creed* : *I believe the Holy Scriptures of the*
 " *Old and New Testament, to be a Divine, Infalible, and*
 " *Compleat Rule, both for Faith and Manners* : I hope
 " no Protestant would think a Man damned for such
 " addition : And if so, then this Creed of *Athanasius*
 " is at least an *unnecessary Rule of Faith*.

Answer.

That is to say, it is an addition to the Catholick
 Faith, to own the Scriptures to be the Rule of Faith :
 As if it were an addition to the Laws of *England* to
 own the Original Records of them in the *Tower* :
 For the Catholick Faith is what we are to believe, the
 Rule of Faith is that Book or Writing wherein this
 Catholick Faith is to be found, and upon the Autho-
 rity

rity of which we must believe it; and therefore what the Catholick Faith is, and what is the Rule of Faith, are two very distinct Questions; and to apply what is said of the Catholick Faith, to the Rule of Faith, becomes the Wit and understanding of an Heretick: This is the very Argument, which the Papists use against our Authors Compleat and Infallible Rule of Faith, the Scriptures, that they do not contain all things necessary to Salvation, because they do not prove the great Fundamental of the Protestant Faith, that the Canon of Scripture, which we receive, is the Word of God; now what Answer he would give to Papists, with reference to the sufficiency of Scripture, let him suppose, I give him the same Answer in Vindication of the Catholick Faith of the *Athanasian* Creed, and we are right again.

But his parting blow is worth some little observation, That if the Scriptures be a compleat Rule of Faith, *then this Creed of Athanasius is at least an unnecessary Rule of Faith*: But why did he not say the same thing of the Apostles Creed, or *Nicene* Creed, or any other Creeds, as well as of the *Athanasian* Creed? for it seems a Creed, as a Creed (for there is no other sense to be made of it) is a very *unnecessary* thing, if the Scripture be a compleat Rule of Faith: And thus both Catholicks and Hereticks, even his dear *Arians* and *Socinians*, have troubled themselves and the World to no purpose, in drawing up Creeds and Confessions of Faith.

But this Author ought to be sent to School to learn the difference between a Creed, and a Rule of Faith: A Rule of Faith is a divinely inspired Writing, which contains all matters to be believed, and upon the Authority of which we do believe; a Creed is a Summary

mary of Faith, or a Collection of such Articles, as we ought to believe, the Truth of which we must examine by some other Rule: the sum then of our Author's Argument is this: That because the Scripture is the Rule of Faith, and contains all things necessary to be believed, therefore it is very unnecessary to collect out of the Scripture such Propositions, as are necessary for all Christians explicitly to believe: He might as well have proved from the Scriptures being a compleat Rule of Faith, that therefore there is no necessity of Commentators, or Sermons, or Catechisms, as that there is no necessity of Creeds.

But as senseless as this is, there is a very deep fetch in it; for he would have no other Creed, but that *the Scripture is the Divine, Infallible, Compleat Rule of Faith, which makes all other Creeds unnecessary*; and then he can make what he pleases of Scripture, as all other Hereticks have done before him: But let me ask this Author, whether to believe in general, that the Scripture is the compleat Rule of Faith, without an explicate belief of what is contained in Scripture, will carry a Man to Heaven? There seems to me no great difference between this general Faith in the Scriptures, without particularly knowing and believing what they teach, and believing as the Church believes.

We suppose then, he will grant us the necessity of an explicate belief of all things contained in the Scripture necessary to Salvation; and ought not the Church then to instruct People, what these necessary Articles of Faith are, and what is the true sense of Scripture about them? Especially when there are a great many damnable Heresies taught in the Church
by

by Men of perverse Minds, who wrest the Scriptures to their own destruction; and does not this shew the necessity of Orthodox Creeds and Formularies of Faith?

And this puts me in mind of the great usefulness of ancient Creeds, though the Holy Scripture be the only Divine and Infallible Rule of Faith, *viz.* That they are a kind of secondary Rule, as containing the Traditionary Faith of the Church: It is no hard matter for witty Men to put very perverse senses on Scripture to favour their heretical Doctrines, and to defend them with such Sophistry as shall easily impose upon unlearned and unthinking Men; and the best way in this case is, to have recourse to the ancient Faith of the Christian Church, to learn from thence, how these Articles were understood and professed by them: for we cannot but think, that those who conversed with the Apostles, and did not only receive the Scriptures, but the sense and interpretation of them from the Apostles, or Apostolical Men, understood the true Christian Faith much better than those at a farther remove; and therefore as long as we can reasonably suppose this Tradition to be preserved in the Church, their Authority is very Venerable; and this gives so great and venerable Authority to some of the first General Councils; and therefore we find *Tertullian* himself confuting the Hereticks of his days, by this argument from Prescription, or the constant Tradition of all Apostolick Churches, which was certain and unquestionable at that time; and as much as Papists pretend to Tradition, we appeal to Tradition for the first Three or Four Centuries; and if the Doctrine of the *Athanasian* Creed have as good a Tradition as this, as certainly it has, it is unnecessary

A Vindication of the Doctrine of the

cessary Rule, though we do not make it a primary and uncontrollable Rule, as the Holy Scripture is: where there are two different Senses put on Scripture, it is certainly the safest, to embrace that sense (if the words will bear it) which is most agreeable to the received Doctrine of the Primitive Church, contained in the Writings of her Doctors, or Ancient Creeds, or such Creeds, as are conformed to the Doctrine of the Primitive Church.

Notes.

" Then for taking ought from this Creed, the whole Greek Church (diffused through so many Provinces) rejects as Heretical that Period of it, *The Holy Ghost is of the Father and of the Son*: contending that the Holy Spirit is from the Father only; which also they clearly and demonstratively prove, as we shall see in its proper place. And for the menace here of *Athanasius*, that they shall perish everlastingly; they laugh at it, and say, *He was drunk, when he made that Creed.* Gennad. Schol. Arch Bishop of Constantin.

Answer.

This Addition of the *Filioque*, or the Holy Ghost proceeding from the Father and from the Son, which was disputed between the Greek and Latin Church, is no corruption of the Essentials of the Christian Faith about the Doctrine of the Holy Trinity, as I observed before; nor does *Athanasius* deny Salvation to those, who do not believe it: For he that will be saved, must thus think of the Trinity, does not relate to every particular Word and Phrase, but to that Doctrine, which immediately proceeds; That the Trinity in Unity, and Unity in Trinity, is to be Worshipped, which the Greeks acknowledged

as

Holy and Ever Blessed TRINITY.

31

as well as the *Latins*, and therefore agreed in the Substantials of Faith, necessary to Salvation.

And that I have reason for what I say, appears from this; that after the *Latins* were perswaded, that the Holy Ghost did proceed from the Son they were far enough from denying Salvation to those, who believed otherwise: Pope *Leo III.* assented to the definition of the Council of *Aquisgrane*, *An. 809* concerning the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Son and yet would by no means allow, that it should be added to the Creed; nor would he deny Salvation to those who believed otherwise; but when that Question was asked him, returned this Answer; *That* *Vossius de tribus Symbol. dissert. 3 Cap. 29, 30.*
whoever has subtilty enough to attain to the Knowledge of this, or knowing it, will not believe it, cannot be saved; but there are many, and this among the rest, deep Mysteries of the Holy Faith, which all cannot reach to, some by reason of Age, others for want of understanding, and therefore as we said before, he that can, and won't, cannot be saved: And therefore at the same time he commanded the Constantinopolitan Creed to be hung up at Rome in a Silver Table without the addition of the Filioque: nor can any man tell when this was added to the Creed; however we never read the Greeks were Anathematized upon this account, till Pope Urban II. 1097. and in the Council of Florence under Eugenius IV. 1438-9. Joseph the Patriarch of Constantinople thought this Controversie between the two Churches might be reconciled, and the Filioque added in a sense very consistent with the belief of the Greek Church. *Cap. 31. Ibid.*

As for what he adds, that the Greek Church condemned this addition as *Heretical*, I desire to know,

F

what

Ibid.
Cap. 44.

what *Greek Council* did this ; *Kossus* a very diligent Observer, gives no account of it ; the quarrel of the *Greeks* with the *Latins* was, That they undertook without the Authority of a General Council, to add to the Creed of a General Council, when the Council of *Ephesus* and *Chalcedon* had Anathematized those, who did so ; and therefore for this reason the *Greeks* Anathematized the *Latin Church*, without declaring the *Filioque* to be Heretical, and as that Learned Man observes, this was the true cause of the Schism, that the *Greeks* thought, the Pope of *Rome*, and a Western Synod, took too much upon themselves, to add to the Creed of a General Council, by their own Authority, without consulting the *Eastern Church*, which was equally concerned in matters of Faith.

But the Comical part is still behind ; for he says, *The Greeks laugh at Athanasius's menace, and say he was drunk, when he made the Creed* ; and for this he refers us to *Georgius Scholarius*, or *Gennadius*, who was made Patriarch of *Constantinople* by *Mahomet*, when he had taken that City. I confess, I have not read all that *Gennadius* has Writ, and know not where to find this place, and he has not thought fit to direct us : but this I know, that whether *Gennadius* says this himself, or only reports it as the saying of some foolish *Greeks* (for I cannot guess by our Author, which it is) whoever said it, said more then is true, for *Athanasius* neither made the Creed, drunk nor sober, for as most Learned Men agree, he never made it at all, though it bears his name ; but I wish I could see this place in *Gennadius*, for I greatly suspect our Author ; *Gennadius* being a very unlikely Man to say any ill thing of *Athanasius* upon account of the *Filioque*, who himself took

took the side of the *Latin Church* in this dispute, and as *Vossius* relates, gives *Athanasius* a very different, and more honourable Character *ὁ τῆς ἀληθείας κηρύξ ἐν ἐριλογίᾳ ὁ μέγας Ἀθανάσιος.* The *Differt. 2. c. 1.*
great *Athanasius* the Preacher and Confessor of Truth.

But there is nothing finites me more than to hear this *Arian*, or *Socinian*, or whatever he is, affirm, That the *Greeks* have clearly and demonstratively proved, that the *Holy Spirit* is from the Father only; For that which is proved clearly and demonstratively, I hope is true; and then this alone is a confutation of his *brief Notes*, for the *Greeks* taught, and proved *demonstratively*, as he says, that the *Holy Spirit* so proceeds from the Father only as to be of the same Substance, and One God with the Father.

And the *Catholick Faith* is this.

"*Catholick Faith* is as much as to say in plain *Creed.*
" *English*, the Faith of the whole Church; now in what *Notes.*
" Age was this, which here follows, the Faith of the
" whole Church?"

The *Catholick Faith*, I grant, is so called with relation to the *Catholick Church*, whose Faith it is, and the *Catholick Church* is the *Universal Church*, or all the true Churches in the World, which are all but one whole Church, united in *Christ* their Head: the Profession of the true Faith and Worship of *Christ* makes a true Church, and all true Churches are the One *Catholick Church* whether they be spread over all the World, or shut up in any one corner of it, as at the first Preaching of the

Answer.

Gospel the Catholick Church was no where but in *Judea*. Now as no Church is the Catholick Church of Christ; how far soever it has spread it self over the World, unless it profess the true Faith of Christ; no more is any Faith the Catholick Faith, how universally soever it be professed, unless it be the true Faith of Christ; nor does the true Christian Faith cease to be Catholick, how few soever there be, who sincerely profess it. It is down-right Popery to judge of the Catholick Church by its multitudes or large extent, or to judge of the Catholick Faith by the vast Numbers of its Professors: were there but one true Church in the World, that were the Catholick Church, because it would be the whole Church of Christ on Earth; and were the true Christian Faith professed but in one such Church, it would be the Catholick Faith still; for it is the Faith of the whole true Church of Christ, the sincere belief and profession of which makes a Catholick Church.

Notes.

“Not in the Age of *Athanasius* himself, who for this Faith, and for Seditious Practices, was banished from *Alexandria* in *Ægypt* (where he was Bishop) no less than four times; whereof the first was by *Constantine* the Great.

Answer.

What shall be done unto Thee, thou lying Tongue? What impudence is this, to think to sham the World at this time a day, with such stories as these: when the Case of *Athanasius* is so well known, or may be, even to *English* Readers, who will take the pains to read his Life, written with great exactness and fidelity by the learned *Dr. Cave*.

But

But when he thinks a second time of it, will he say, that the Church of God in *Athanasius's* Age, was not of the same Faith with him? What thinks he of the *Nicene* Fathers, who condemned *Arius*? In which Council *Athanasius* himself was present, and bore a considerable part, and so provoked the *Arian* Faction by his Zeal for the Catholick Faith, and his great skill and dexterity in managing that Cause, as laid the Foundation of all his future Troubles.

Will he say that *Constantine* the Great, who called the Council at *Nice* in the Cause of *Arius*, and was so zealous an Asserter of the *Nicene* Faith, banished *Athanasius* for this Faith? No, his greatest Enemies durst not make his Faith any part of their Accusation, though it was the only Reason of their Malice against him; but they charged him with a great many other Crimes; and that the Reader may the better understand by what Spirit these Men were acted, which still appears in this Author, I shall give a short Account of the Story.

The *Arian* Faction headed by *Eusebius* of *Nicomedia*, perceiving how impossible it was to retrieve their lost Cause, while *Athanasius* was in Credit, and so great Authority in the Church, having ripened their Designs against him in their private Cabals, prevail with *Constantine* to call a Council at *Casarea* in *Palestine*, at which *Athanasius* did not appear, suspecting, probably, the partiality of his Judges, who were his declared Enemies. This was represented at Court as a contempt of the Imperial Orders, and another Council was appointed at *Tyre*, which met *Ann.* 335. with a peremptory Command for his appearance; where he first excepted against the competency of his

his Judges, but that being over-ruled, he was forced to plead.

And first he was charged with Oppression and Cruelty; particularly towards *Ischyrras*, *Callinicus*, and the *Miletian* Bishops, but this tell of it self, for want of proof. In the next place, he was accused for having ravished a Woman, and one too who had vowed Virginity; The Woman was brought into the Council, and there owned the Fact; but *Timotheus*, one of *Athanasius's* Friends, personates *Athanasius*, and asks the Woman, whether he had ever offered such Violence to her; she supposing him to have been *Athanasius*, roundly declared him to be the Man who had done the Fact; and thus this cheat was discovered. His next Accusation was, That he had murdered *Arsenius*, a *Miletian* Bishop, whose hand he had cut off, and kept by him for some Magical Uses; and the Hand dried and salted was taken out of a Box and shewn to the Council: and to make this more credible, they had of a long time conveyed *Arsenius* away, and kept him out of sight: But he having made his escape about this time, and being accidentally met by some Friends of *Athanasius*, was on a sudden brought into the Council, where he shewed both his Hands safe, to the shame and confusion of the malicious Inventors of that Lye. This failing, they accuse him of Impiety, and Profanation of Holy Things: That his Ordination was tumultuary and irregular; the contrary of which was evidently true: That *Macarius* his Presbyter, by his command, had broke into *Ischyrras's* Chancel, while he was performing the Holy Offices, and overturned the Communion-Table, broke in pieces the Sacramental Chalice, and burnt the Holy Books; all which *Ischyrras*

was present to attest ; but the contrary in every branch of the Accusation was made apparent , and the whole Plot discovered by a writing under *Ischyra* his own hand, sufficiently attested.

After all these shameful baffles they would not give over, but sent Commissioners from the Synod to inquire into the matter of fact upon the place, and having raked together any thing , which they could make look like Evidence, though gained by the most barbarous Cruelties, and other vile arts, they return to the Council, who without more ado condemn and depose *Athanasius* from his Bishoprick, and command him to go no more to *Alexandria* ; upon this he withdrew himself and went to Court, prays the Emperor for a more fair and impartial Tryal, who thereupon sent to the Council, then adjourned to *Jerusalem*, to come to *Constantinople*, and make good their charge; Five Commissioners appeared, who joyned with some others, whom they could get together, formed a small Synod, but not daring to insist upon their former accusations, start up a new Charge more like to take at Court, *viz.* That he had threatned to stop the Emperors Fleet, that yearly Transported Corn from *Alexandria* to *Constantinople* ; which was as true and as probable a story as any of the rest : but they told this with such confidence , and urged the ill consequences of it so home upon the Emperor, that they prevailed with him to banish *Athanasius* to *Triers* in *Germany*. If this short story does not make our Author blush, he is possessed with the true Spirit of the *Tyrian* Fathers. But to proceed,

“ He was also condemned in his own life time by
 “ Six Councils, as an Heretick, and Seditious person ;
 “ of

A Vindication of the Doctrine of the

" of these Councils, that at *Milan* consisted of Three
 " Hundred Bishops, and that of *Arminum* of Five Hun-
 " dred and fifty, the greatest Convention of Bishops
 " that ever was. This consent of the Churches of
 " God against him and his Doctrine, occasioned that
 " famous Proverb, *Athanasius against all the World,*
 " *and all the World against Athanasius.*

Answer.

This is all Sham. I grant, *Athanasius* was condemned by several *Arian* Conventicles (which he prophanelly calls the Churches of God) in his own life time, but I deny, that he was condemned as a *Heresick*, or that he was condemned for his Faith. We have seen the account of his condemnation by the Council of *Tyre* already, and for what pretended Crimes he was condemned, without the least mention of his Heresie; for if this Author understood any thing of the story of those times, he must know, that though the *Arian* cause was vigorously and furiously promoted, yet it was done more covertly, since that fatal blow which was given it by the Council of *Nice*, whose Authority was too sacred to be easily born down: and therefore they did not pretend to unsettle the *Nicene* Faith, nay pretended to own it, though they did not like the word *Homo-ousios*, and therefore formed various Creeds, as they pretended to the same sense without that litigious word: which shews that it was not time of day for them to accuse *Athanasius* of Heresie, but, of such other Crimes, as might condemn and depose him, and remove him out of the way, that he might not hinder their Designs.

Thus in the Council at *Antioch*, in the Reign of *Constantius*, 341, the old Calumnies are revived against

gainst *Athanasius*, and he deposed again, after he had been restored by *Constantine* the younger, and *George* the *Cappadocian*, a Man of mean Birth, base Education, and worse Temper (for they could find no better Man, that would accept it) was advanced to the Patriarchal Chair; but all this while, he was charged with no Heresie in Faith: But that his return to *Alexandria* had occasioned great Trouble and Sorrow there, and the effusion of much Blood: that being condemned by a Synod, and not restored again by the Authority of a Synod, he re-assumed his Chair again, contrary to the Canons, &c.

Upon this *Athanasius* fled to *Rome*, where in a Synod of *Western* Bishops, he was absolved, and restored to Communion, contrary to the earnest Solicitations of the Council of *Antioch*. Anno 347, a Council of *Eastern* and *Western* Bishops was called at *Sardica*; where the *Eastern* Bishops, (who were most of them *Arians*, or Favourers of that Party) refused to joyn with them of the *West*, and acted in a separate Assembly, and had brought with them Count *Masimianus*, and *Eusebius*, an Officer of the Imperial Palace, to countenance and promote their proceedings; and having bespattered *Athanasius* with all the ill things they had formerly charged him with, and tried in vain to delay the Sentence of the *Western* Bishops, they proceeded Synodically to condemn and depose him, together with several other principal Bishops of the *Catholic* Party; of all which they published an *Encyclical* or *Decretal* Epistle wherein they gave a large account of their whole proceeding. The *Western* Bishops in the mean time, after a large and particular Examination of *Athanasius's* Case, and all Matters of Fact relating to him, acquitted and resto-

red him; and having heard the Complaints made to the Synod from all parts concerning the Grievances they lay under from the *Arian* Faction; they particularly condemned and deposed the chief Heads of that Party, and banished them from the Communion of the Faithful, publishing an account of what they had done in several Synodical Letters: Thus far it was pretty well with *Athanasius*, for all the Churches of God did not condemn him; if he were condemned by the *Eastern* Bishops in a Schismatical Conventicle, he was absolved by the *Western* Council; if he was condemned by the *Arians*, he was absolved by the *Catholicks*; but still his Faith was no matter of the Dispute.

But now the Zeal of *Constantius* reduced *Athanasius* to greater extremity; for he lying at *Arles* in *France* Anno 353, a Synod was held there, where all Arts were used to procure the condemnation of *Athanasius*; at least by refusing to hold Communion with him, to which most of the Bishops yielded, and *Vincentius* of *Capua* himself, the Pope's chief Legate, subscribed the Condemnation; *Paulinus* of *Triers* for his honest courage and constancy in refusing it, being driven into Banishment.

Not contented with this, as if poor *Athanasius* could never be often enough condemned, Anno 355, *Constantius* going to *Milan*, another Synod was called there, and the *Catholic* Bishops were strictly required to subscribe the Condemnation of *Athanasius*; and the Emperor himself being present in the Synod, drew his Sword, and fiercely told them, That it must be so, that he himself accused *Athanasius*, and that his Testimony ought to be believed: And for refusing to comply, *Eusebius Vercellenfis*, *Lucifer*
Ca-

Carastanus, and several others were sent into Banishment. This is the Council, which as our Author tells us, consisted of Three hundred Bishops, but the Emperor was more than all the rest, and it was he, that extorted the Condemnation of *Athanasius*; and let him make his best of this.

The like Violence was used in other Synods, as in that of *Syrmium*, Anno 357, where a Confession of Faith was drawn up, which *Hosius* of *Corduba* was forced to subscribe, and as some say, to condemn *Athanasius*. Anno 359; was his other great Council at *Ariminum*, of Five hundred and fifty Bishops, where they were so managed by the subtilty and importunity of some few *Arian* Bishops, and so wearied out by *Taurus* the Prefect, and that by the command of the Emperor, that they generally yielded, several of them being even starved into compliance: and this is the time of which *St. Jerom* speaks, that the whole World wondered to see itself *Arian*: By such Councils, and by such Arts as these *Athanasius* was condemned, though he was never accused nor condemned for his Faith: and that veneration the whole Christian World has had ever since for the Name of *Athanasius*, is a sufficient Vindication of his Person and Faith, notwithstanding the ill usage he met with under an *Arian* Emperor.

As for his next Paragraph, wherein he appeals to the late *Arian* Historian, *Chr. Sandius*, I shall only refer the Reader to Dr. *Bull's* Answer, and I think I am more than even with him; and whoever will read and consider what that learned Man has irrefragably proved, that those Fathers, who lived before the Council of *Nice*, were yet of the same Faith with the *Nicene* Fathers, as to the Doctrine of the Holy

Trinity, will see, that a very modest Man may call this the *Catholic Faith*, even in his sense of the word *Catholic*, as it signifies the common Faith of Christians in all Ages, since the Preaching of the Gospel in the World: And that it requires both *Forehead* and *Forgery* to deny it. And if in that Age *Athanasius* were the only Man who durst openly and boldly defend the *Catholic Faith*, against a prevailing Faction, supported by a Court Interest, and grown formidable by Lies and Calumnies, and the most barbarous Cruelties, it is for his immortal Honour, and will always be thought so by the Churches of Christ.

And now I come to answer his terrible Objections against the several Articles of this Creed, which he has endeavoured to ridicule; and when I have done so, I hope he will think it time to consider, what it is to ridicule the *Christian Faith*: A modest Man would not affront the general Faith of Christians, at least of that Church in which he lives; and a cautious Man, whatever his private Opinion were, would not ridicule so venerable a Mystery, lest it should prove true; which is the same Argument we use to make *Atheists* modest, not to laugh at the Notion of a God, lest he should find the God, whom he has so impudently affronted, when he comes into the other World.

SECT. IV.

The Catholick Doctrine of a Trinity in Unity, and Unity in Trinity explained, and vindicated from all pretended Absurdities and Contradictions.

THE Catholick Faith is this, That we worship Creed.
One God in Trinity, and Trinity in Unity.

“He means here, That we must so worship the Notes.
“One True God, as to remember he is Three Persons; and so worship the Three Persons, as to bear in mind, they are but One Substance, or Godhead; or God: So the Author explains himself in the “Three next Articles, which are these:

Neither confounding the Persons, nor dividing the Substance: for there is One Person of the Father, another of the Son, another of the Holy Ghost: but the Godhead of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, is all One. “Therefore all these Articles “make indeed but One Article, which is this: The “One true God is *Three distinct Persons*, and Three “distinct Persons (Father, Son, and Holy Ghost) are “the One true God.

Thus far I agree with this Author; and indeed this is *Answer.*
the whole of the Creed, as far as relates to the Doctrine of the Trinity, that there are *Three Persons and One God*, all the rest being only a more particular explication of this; and therefore I would desire the Reader to observe, for the understanding this Creed, what belongs to the Persons, and what to the One Eternal undivided Substance or Godhead, which will answer all the

the seeming Contradictions which are charged on this Doctrine. But he proceeds :

Notes.

“ Plainly as if a Man should say, *Peter, James,*
 “ and *John*, being Three Persons, are One Man ;
 “ and One Man is these Three Persons, *Peter, James,*
 “ and *John*. Is it not now a ridiculous attempt, as
 “ well as a barbarous Indignity, to go about thus to
 “ make Asses of all Mankind, under a pretence of
 “ teaching them a Creed, and Things Divine, to de-
 “ spoil them of their Reason, the Image of God, and
 “ the Character of our Nature? But let us in two
 “ words, examine the Parts of this monstrous Propo-
 “ sition, as 'tis laid down in the Creed itself.

Neither confounding the Persons, nor dividing the Substance.

“ But how can we not but confound the Persons,
 “ that have (say they) but *One numerical Substance* ;
 “ and how can we but divide the Substance, which
 “ we find in *Three distinct divided Persons*.

Answer.

Our Author should have kept to *Athanasius's* Creed, which he undertook to expose, and then we had not heard of this Objection: for the Creed does not say, that there are Three Persons in *One numerical Substance*, but in *One undivided Substance*; nor does it say, that there are Three divided Persons in this One undivided Substance, but *Three Persons*, which may be *Three*, and yet not divided, but intimately united to each other in one undivided Substance: Now tho' we should grant it unconceivable, how Three distinct Persons should have One numerical

cal Essence, that the Essence of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost should be numerically the same, and yet their Persons distinct; [for it is not easie to distinguish the Essence or Substance from the Person, and therefore not easie to tell, how there should be but One Substance and Three Persons,] yet it is no Absurdity or Contradiction to say, that Three real substantial Persons should subsist in One undivided Substance, and then there is no necessity either *to confound the Persons, or divide the Substance.* We must allow the Divine Persons to be real substantial Beings, if we allow each Person to be God; unless we will call any thing a God, which has no real Being, as that has not, which has not a real Nature and Essence; whereas all Men grant there are no Accidents, or Qualities, or Modes in God, but a pure and simple Essence or pure Act; and therefore the Three Divine Persons are substantially distinct, though in One undivided Substance: which shews, that to say, *That the One true God is Three distinct Persons, and Three distinct Persons are the One true God, is not plainly, as if a Man should say, That Peter, James, and John, being Three Persons are One Man, and One Man is Three distinct Persons, Peter, James, and John:* Because *Peter, James, and John*, are not only distinct, but divided and separate Persons, which have Three divided and separate Substances, which therefore cannot be One Man, as Three distinct Persons in One undivided Substance are One God:

This is sufficient to vindicate the *Athanasian Creed*, which only asserts Three distinct Persons in One undivided Substance, which has nothing absurd or contradictory in it; but because this Author founds his Objection upon *One numerical Substance*, let us briefly consider

consider that too ; for the Divine Essence or Substance is certainly *numerically One*, as there is but One God ; and the difficulty is, how Three distinct substantial Persons can subsist in One numerical Essence : I will not pretend to fathom such a Mystery as this, but only shew, that there is nothing absurd in it, and take down the confidence of this vain Pretender to Reason and Demonstration.

Let us then enquire, what it is, that makes any Substance *numerically One*, that if there be any Absurdity in this, we may find out where it lies.

Now in unorganiz'd Matter, it is nothing else but the union of Parts, which hang all together, that makes such a Body One ; whether it be simple or compounded of different kinds of Matter, that is One numerical Body, whose Parts hang all together. In Organical Bodies, the Union of all Parts, which constitute such an organized Body, makes it One entire numerical Body, though the Parts have very different Natures and Offices ; but this is of no use to explain the numerical Oneness of the Divine Essence, because the Divine Substance has no Extension, and no Parts, and therefore cannot be One by an Union of Parts.

In finite created Spirits, which have no Parts and no Extension neither, that we know of, no more than a Thought, or an Idea, or a Passion, have Extension or Parts ; their numerical Oneness can be nothing else, but every Spirit's Unity with itself, and distinct and separate subsistence from all other created Spirits. Now this Self unity of the Spirit, which has no Parts to be united, can be nothing else but *Self-consciousness* : That it is conscious to its own Thoughts,

Thoughts, Reasonings, Passions, which no other finite Spirit is conscious to but itself: This makes a finite Spirit numerically One, and separates it from all other Spirits; that every Spirit feels only its own Thoughts and Passions, but is not conscious to the Thoughts and Passions of any other Spirit: And therefore if there were Three created Spirits so united as to be conscious to each others Thoughts and Passions, as they are to their own, I cannot see any reason, why we might not say, that Three such Persons were numerically One, for they are as much One with each other, as every Spirit is One with itself; unless we can find some other Unity for a Spirit than Self-consciousness; and, I think, this does help us to understand in some measure this great and venerable Mystery of a *Trinity in Unity*.

For God being present every where without Parts, and without Extension, we must strip our Minds of all material Images and Figures, when we contemplate the Unity of the Divine Nature. Though we should suppose but One Person in the Godhead, as well as One God, (as this Author does) yet we must consider his Unity, not as the Unity of an infinite Body, but an infinite Mind, which has no distinct Parts to be united; and let any Man, who can, give me any other Notion of the numerical Oneness of an infinite Mind, but Self-consciousness: that though present every where, it is still intimate with itself: and in the very same way, and for the very same reason, Three Divine Persons, who are as intimate to each other, and if I may so speak, as mutually conscious to each other, as any One Person can be to itself, are truly and properly *numerically One*. *This,*

This, I suppose, is what several Ancient Fathers called *μετεχέωσις*, or Circumincession, which I confess is an ill word, and apt to raise very material Imaginations in us, as if the Divine Persons were united in One Substance, as Three Bodies would be, could they touch in every Point; whereas we know not, what the Substance of an infinite Mind is, nor how such Substances as have no Parts or Extension can touch each other, or be thus externally united; but we know the Unity of a Mind or Spirit, reaches as far as its Self-consciousness does: for that is One Spirit, which knows and feels itself, and its own thoughts and motions: and if we mean this by Circumincession, Three Persons thus intimate to each other are numerically One: And therefore St. *Austin* represents this much better by that Self-consciousness which is between those distinct Faculties in us, of Memory, Understanding and Will, which know and feel whatever is in each other: We remember what we understand and will, we understand, what we remember and will, and what we will, we remember and understand; and therefore these Three Faculties, which are thus intimate to each other, make one Man; and if we can suppose Three Infinite Minds and Persons, thus conscious of whatever is in each other, as they are of themselves, they can be but One numerical God: *etiam si tres sint, etiam unus est.*

*Aug. lib. contra
Serm. Arrian,
c. 16.*

But that this may not be thought a meer arbitrary and groundless conjecture, I shall shew you, that this is the true Scripture Notion of the Unity of the God-head, or of Three Persons and One God.

That the Three Divine Persons, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, are Three Infinite Minds, really distinct from each other; that the Father is not the Son, nor

Holy and Ever Blessed TRINITY.

51

nor the Holy Ghost either the Father, or the Son, is so very plain in Scripture, that I shall not spend time to prove it, especially since it is supposed in this Controversie ; for when we enquire , how these Three Infinite Minds or Persons are One God, it supposes, that they are distinct ; and if there were any Dispute about it, what I shall say in explaining their Unity , will prove their Distinction , that they are Three distinct infinite minds.

1. Let us then consider , what the Unity is between the Father and the Son , for so our Saviour tells us, *I and the Father are One*, 10 John 30. And how they are One, we learn from several places in this Gospel, which as the Ancients tell us, was wrote on purpose in opposition to the Heresie of *Carinthus*, to prove, that Christ was not meer Man, but the Eternal Son of God, and One with his Father : Now 1 John 1. the Evangelists call him the $\lambda\omicron\gamma\omega$, or the Word of God, the Eternal Wisdom and Reason of God, and therefore as intimate to God as his own Eternal Word and Wisdom ; as intimate as a Man's own Wisdom and Reason is to him ; and therefore he adds, that this Word which was in the beginning, was $\pi\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\varsigma\tau\omicron\upsilon\delta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$ with God, as we translate it, which cannot signifie a local presence, but an essential union, or a being in God, as Christ tells us, *The Father is in me*, and *I in him*, 10 John 38. for before place was made, or any thing to fill it, to be with God, could signifie nothing else but to subsist in him : and therefore, v. 18. the Apostle expounds this being with God , by being *in the bosome of the Father* ; which cannot signifie an External Union , because God has no External Bosom ; but Bosom signifies the very Essence of God , and if we could distinguish

Parts in God, the most inward and secret recesses of the Divine Nature: Now this intimate Union and *In-being*, when we speak of an essential Union of pure and infinite Minds, is a mutual consciousness, and if I may so speak, an inward sensation of each other, to know and feel each other, as they know and feel themselves.

To represent this plainly and intelligibly, if it be possible, to the meanest understanding, I shall consider, wherein the most perfect Union of created Spirits consist, which are distinct and separate Beings from each other; wherein the Union of the Divine Persons in the Ever Blessed Trinity answers this, and wherein it excels it.

Now created Spirits, as Angels and Humane Souls, are then most perfectly united to each other, when they most perfectly know one another, and know all that each other knows, and perfectly agree in all they know, which is an Union in Knowledge: when they perfectly love one another, have the same will, the same affections, the same interests and designs; when they are a kind of Unisons, which move and act a like, as if one Soul animated them both: This is that perfect Unity, which is so frequently and earnestly recommended to Christians both by Christ and his Apostles; as we may see every-where in Scripture.

And the very same Union with this, there is between the Persons of the Ever Blessed Trinity; an Union in knowledge, in love, in will, in works.

The Son perfectly knows the Father, and therefore knows all that the Father knows; this St. John means when he tells us, That he is in the Bosom of the Father: 1 John 18. *No man hath seen God at any time*: that is, no Man ever had a perfect knowledge of God, which

which is here called *seeing*, because sight gives us the most distinct and perfect knowledge of things: *The only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him*: Where it is plain, to be in the bosom of the Father, is put to signifie the most perfect and intimate knowledge of him; as in ordinary speech to take any Man into our bosom, signifies to impart all our Secrets to him: but our Saviour tells us this in plain words; that the Father perfectly knows the Son, and the Son the Father, 10 John 15. *As the Father knoweth me, so know I the Father.* Thus the Father loveth the Son, 3 Joh. 25. 5. Joh. 20. And the Son loveth the Father, 14 John 31. Thus the Son has no will but his Fathers, 5 John 20. *I can of my own self do nothing, as I hear, I judge, and my judgment is just; because I seek not mine own will, but the will of the Father, which hath sent me,* 6 John 38. *For I came not to do my own will, but the will of him that sent me.* 4 John 34. *My meat is to do the will of him that sent me and to finish his work*: Thus whatever Christ did or spake, it was in conformity to his Father, what he saw, and heard, and learnt of him. 5 John 19. *The Son can do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father do; for whatsoever things he doth, these also doth the Son likewise.* 12 John 49. *I have not spoken of my self, but the Father that sent me, he gave me a commandment, what I should say, and what I should speak*: This is as perfect an Union, as Union signifies agreement and concord, as can possibly be between two minds and spirits.

The like may be said of the Holy Ghost: He perfectly knows the Father, and his most secret Councils: *For the spirit searcheth all things, yea the deep things of God,* 1 Cor. 2. 10. He is the Spirit of Wisdom and

Re-

Revelation, who inspired the Prophets and Apostles, to declare God and his will to the World, and therefore is most intimately acquainted with it himself. Thus our Saviour comforts his Apostles, when he was to leave them himself, with the Promise of the Spirit, who should guide them into all truth. 16 *Job.* 13, 14, 15. *Howbeit when he the Spirit of truth is come, he shall guide you into all truth; for he shall not speak of himself, but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak, and he will shew you things to come. He shall glorify me, for he shall receive of mine, and shall shew it unto you: All things that the Father hath are mine, therefore said I, that he shall take of mine, and shall shew it unto you.* Of which words more hereafter; at present I only observe, how intimately the Holy Spirit is acquainted with all the Secrets both of Father and Son, whatever things the Father knows, that the Son knows, and what the Son knows, that the Holy Spirit knows; that is, whatever the Father knows, which is first said to be the Father's, then the Son's, and then the Holy Spirit's, according to the Order of Persons in the adorable Trinity.

Thus the Holy Spirit is the Spirit of Love, which inspires us with the love of God, and gives us the reciprocal Testimonies of God's love to us: *For the love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost, which is given unto us,* 5 *Rom.* 5. And as some of the Ancients represent it, he is that love, wherewith the Father and the Son love each other; and therefore there is no question, but that he who unites Father and Son, and unites God to us, and us to God, by love, is united to Father and Son by love himself.

He is that Holy Spirit, who renews and sanctifies us, and subdues our wills into a conformity and subjection to the will of God; and therefore no doubt, but he has the same will with Father and Son.

Thus Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, are most intimately united in knowledge, will, and affection, but after all, this is no more, than what we call a Moral Union; such as may be between created Spirits, which remain separate Beings still, and though they are morally, are not essentially One; and therefore such an Union as this cannot make Father, Son, and Holy Ghost One God, but Three agreeing and consenting Gods, as *Peter, James, and John*, though they should in the most perfect manner be united, in the same Faith, and mutual love and affection, &c. yet would be Three Men still: And therefore I must now shew, that what is merely a Moral Union between Creatures, is an essential Union between the Persons of the Ever Blessed Trinity.

And this I have already shewn in part. The Three Divine Persons of the Ever Blessed Trinity, are united in knowledge, in will, in love: but are not united as Creatures are by an external likeness, conformity, agreement, consent, in knowledge, will, and affection; but are so united to each other, as every Man is to himself, not as one Man is to another.

As for instance: Every Man by an inward sensation feels his own knowledge, will, and affections, but he does not know any other Man's thoughts, or will, or passions, by feeling them in himself as he does his own, but by an external communication of thoughts; and therefore though they may be morally One by an exact

exact agreement and harmony of thoughts and passions, as far as by external communication they can know, what each others thoughts and passions are, yet they are essentially distinct and separate: But Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, are One not by an external agreement or consent, but by an internal consciousness, as every Man is One with himself: If I may so speak, because we want proper words to express it, they feel each other in themselves, know the same thing by feeling each others knowledge, and will, and love a-like, by feeling what each other wills and loves, just as every Man feels his own thoughts, knowledge, will, and passions; that is, are as intimate to each other, and as essentially One, by a mutual Self-consciousness, as every Man is One with himself.

And the phrases and expressions of Scripture, whereby the Unity or Oneness of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost are expressed, require this sense. Thus I observed before, that the Son is the eternal word and wisdom of the Father, and therefore as intimate to him, as every Man's Reason is to himself, and knows the Father, not by external Revelation, but as every Man knows himself.

But the most frequent expression, whereby Christ represents this close and intimate and essential Union between his Father and him, is, *I am in the Father, and the Father in me*; which he repeats several times in St. John's Gospel. Now if we will allow this to be a proper, not a metaphorical expression, it can signify no other Union, than what I have now described: That it is a proper, and not a metaphorical expression, appears from this, that there is no such Union in Nature between any two other Beings, as this,

this, to be in *One another*, and a Metaphor is translated from something, that is real and natural, upon account of some likeness and similitude : and therefore that which is like to nothing else, which has no pattern and example, can be no Metaphor, because it alludes to nothing : Now if we speak of a substantial Union, or a Union of Substances, what two Substances can there be in the World, which can mutually be in each other, or can mutually comprehend each other ; which is indeed a palpable contradiction, as signifying at the same time to be greater and to be less than each other ; for in substantial Unions, that which comprehends is greater than that which is comprehended, that which is within any thing else is less than that which contains it : and therefore for two Beings mutually to comprehend, and to be comprehended by each other, is to be greater and less than each other, greater as they comprehend each other, and less as they are comprehended.

So that this Oneness between the Father and the Son, is such an Union as there is nothing in Nature like it, and we cannot long doubt, what kind of Union this is, if we consider, that there is but one possible way to be thus united, and that is by this mutual Consciousness, which I have now described. If the Son be conscious in himself of all that the Father is, as conscious to the knowledge, to the will, to the love of the Father, as he is to his own, by an internal sensation, then the whole Father is in the Son ; if the Father be thus conscious to all that the Son is, then the whole Son is in the Father ; if the Holy Ghost be thus conscious to all that is in the Father and in the Son, then the Father and the Son are in the Holy Ghost, and the Holy Ghost in the Father and the

Son, by this mutual Consciousness to each other: This is very plain and intelligible, and makes them as much One, as every Man is One with himself, by Self-consciousness.

And this is a plain demonstration, that all Three Divine Persons are coessential and coequal with each other: We know nothing of God, but that he is an infinite Mind; that is, infinite Knowledge, Wisdom, Power, Goodness: And if these Three Divine Persons are all internally conscious of all these Perfections, which are in each other, they must all have the same Perfections, the same Knowledge, Wisdom, Power, Goodness, that is the same Nature, unless that Knowledge, Wisdom, Goodness, which we are internally conscious of, and feel within ourselves, be not the Perfections of our Nature; whereas we may externally know those Perfections, which are not ours, but what we feel in ourselves is our own: and therefore this mutual Consciousness, makes all that is the Father's the Son's, and all that is the Son's the Holy Spirit's; as our Saviour speaks: *All things that the Father hath are mine: therefore said I, that he (the Spirit) shall take of mine, and shall shew it unto you,* 16 John 15. And if these Three Persons be thus mutually in each other, as you have already heard, they must be all equal; for if the Father be in the Son, how can the Son be less than the Father, if he comprehends the Father, and all his infinite perfections? If Son and Holy Ghost are in the Father, and Father and Holy Ghost in the Son, and Father and Son in the Holy Ghost, imagine what inequality you can between them; if Son and Holy Ghost are conscious to all the infinite Perfections, which are in the Father, and have all the Perfections, they are conscious

Holy and Ever Blessed TRINITY.

59

ous to, how can Son and Holy Ghost be less perfect than the Father, or then each other: I am sure our Saviour attributes all his Wisdom, and Knowledge, and Power to his intimate conscious Knowledge of his Father, which he calls *seeing him*, which is such a knowledge as Creatures cannot have of God, 5 *John* 19. 20. *Verily, verily, I say unto you, the Son can do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father do; for whatsoever things he doth, those also doth the Son likewise. For the Father loveth the Son, and sheweth him all things, that himself doeth, and he will shew him greater works than these, that ye may marvel.* By this perfect conscious Knowledge, which the Son has of the Father, he has all those Perfections in himself, which are in the Father: he can do whatever he sees the Father do, and he sees whatever the Father does, but can do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father do; He has all the Perfections which are in the Father, and therefore can do whatever he sees the Father do; but there is no knowledge, no perfection, no power in the Son, which is not in the Father, and which he does not receive from the Father, and therefore he can do nothing of himself, but what he sees the Father do; which signifies the most perfect equality between the Father and the Son, founded on the Son's seeing the Father, and whatever he doth, or his intimate Consciousness of all that the Father is. And this is the true Notion of the Son's being the Image of his Father: *The brightness of his Father's glory, and the express Image of his person*, 1 *Heb.* 2. For as a dead Image and Picture represents the external Lineaments and Features of the Person, whose Picture or Image it is, that we can see the Person in his Picture; so a living essential Image, is the living essential perfecti-

ons of the Father, and with a conscious knowledge sees the Father in himself.

For this reason the Son is said *to hear of his Father, to see what his Father doth, and to do the same, to receive commandment from his Father, to do the will of his Father, and the works of his Father, to finish the works, which his Father gave him to do, to glorify his Father, &c.* Which must not be expounded after the manner of Men, (as the Socinians expound such expressions, and thence conclude the great inferiority, inequality, subjection of the Son to the Father, such as there is between a Prince, and the Ministers he employs, and that therefore the Son cannot be the Supream God, for the Supream God can't be commanded, taught, sent on Messages to fulfil the will and pleasure of another, and do nothing but what he sees done, and receives Commission to do; I say, we must not put such a mean and servile sense on these expressions) but we must expound them only to signify that the Son receives all from the Father, Life, Knowledge, Will, Power, by Eternal Generation, and whatever he does, he does with a Consciousness of his Father's Will, and Wisdom, as it were, feeling the Will and Wisdom and Power of his Father in himself; and this he calls hearing and seeing the works of the Father, receiving Commands, and doing the Works of the Father, because his Nature is that to him, which external Teachings and verbal Commands are to Men: he hears, he sees, he does the Works, and Will, and Commands of his Father, by being the perfect, living, self-conscious image of his Father's Will and Knowledge and infinite Perfections.

But

But there is one place more I must take notice of, by which the *Socinians* think to overthrow all that I have now said; that the Union between the Father and Son is not such an essential Unity, as we speak of, but a meer moral Union, or a perfect agreement and consent in knowledge, will, and affection, such as is, or ought to be among Christians; and that our Saviour himself has thus expounded it: 17 *John* 20, 21. *Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also which shall believe on me through their word: That they all may be One, as thou Father art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be One in us:* Which is the very expression I have so much insisted on, to prove this essential Union, and Self-consciousness between the Father and the Son, *As thou Father art in me, and I in thee:* which, it seems, signifies no other kind of Union, than what our Saviour prays for among Christians, *That they also may be One, as thou Father art in me, and I in thee:* Now the Union of Christians is only an Union in Faith and Love, and One Communion, and therefore thus the Father and the Son are One also by a consent and agreement in Knowledge, Will, and Love.

Now this I readily grant, as I observed before, that Father and Son are One by a most perfect agreement in Knowledge, Will, and Love, which we call a Moral Union between Men; and it is this Unity or Oneness for which our Saviour prays, that his Disciples may be One, as the Father and he are One; that they may perfectly agree in the same Faith and Love, that they may speak the same things, and mind the same things: But then this perfect harmony and consent between the Father and the Son results from an essential Unity, from their being *in one another*; which is
such

such an Union as it is impossible there should be between Christians ; but this Moral Union in the same Faith, and mutual love, is called being One, as the Father and Son are One, because it is the nearest resemblance of this essential Unity, that can be between Creatures : and that is the only meaning of *As, That they may be One, As thou Father art in me, and I in Thee* : Not that they may be One in the very same manner, but with such a kind of Unity, as does most nearly resemble the Unity between the Father and the Son ; that is, which produces the like consent and harmony in Will and Affections.

For we must observe, that *As* very often signifies only some likeness and resemblance, not a sameness for kind or degree ; and thus it must of necessity signify in all comparisons between God and Creatures ; for though there is something in Creatures like to what is in God, some faint shadows and images of it, yet nothing in Creatures is the same, that is in God : St. Peter exhorts Christians, *As he which hath called you is holy, so be ye holy in all manner of Conversation,* 1 Pet. 1. 15. And Christ commands us to be perfect as our Father, which is in Heaven is perfect, 5 Matth. 48. But can any Creature be holy and perfect as God is ? Will you hence conclude, that Holiness is not the immutable Nature of God, but the free choice of his Will ; not his Nature, which is One pure simple Act, but an Habit of Virtue, because so it is in us ; and yet we must be holy and perfect as God is, which cannot be, (according to this way of Reasoning) unless holiness in God be the same holiness, which is in Creatures ; and indeed we may as well conclude this, as that the Oneness between the Father and the Son is only a Moral Union in Will and Affe-

Affection, because there can be no other Union between Christians, and yet Christ prays, that they may be One, as He and his Father are One : Since this phrase, *As thou Father art in me, and I in thee*, does evidently signify a great deal more, than such a Moral Union of Will and Affections, why should they not as well conclude, that Christ prays for such an essential Oneness between Christians, as there is between him and his Father; as that the Father and the Son are One in no higher and more perfect sense, than what is applicable to the Unity of Christians with each other ? There may be such a likeness and resemblance between natural and moral Unions, between the Acts and Perfections of Nature, and the Vertues of the Will and Choice, as may be a just foundation for a comparison ; but he is a very absurd Reasoner, who from such a comparison will conclude, they are the same: we are required to *love our Neighbour as our selves* ; but will any Man hence conclude, that the love of our selves, and the love of our Neighbour, are of the same kind ? Which is manifestly false : Self-love being a natural and necessary Passion ; the love of our Neighbour a Christian Vertue ; the first the effect of Nature, the second of Grace ; but the effects so like each other, that they may well be compared, and the natural principle, which acts most equally and necessarily and perfectly, may be made the Rule and Measure of Brotherly love : Thus this essential Unity between the Father and the Son, produces the most perfect harmony and Union of Will and Affections, and therefore is the most perfect Pattern of that Moral Union, which ought to be among Christians.

For

For we may observe, that this Oneness between the Father and the Son, is not the only natural and essential Unity, which is made the Pattern of Unity among Christians; the unity of the natural Body, and the vital sympathy and fellow-feeling, which all the Members of the same natural Body have for each other, is proposed as a pattern also of that mutual love and affection between Christians, *1 Cor. 12. 12--27.* And yet no man will be so absurd as to say; That either Christians are as naturally and vitally united to each other, as the Members of a natural Body are; or that the Members of the natural Body are united only by mutual Love and Affection, as Christians are.

This is sufficient to shew, how Father and Son are One, by a mutual consciousness, whereby they are as intimate to each other, as every man is to himself, who knows all that is in himself, and feels all the motions and workings of his own mind; and we need not doubt, but the Holy Spirit is in the same manner One with Father and Son: But I must not expect, that the Adversaries I have to deal with, will grant any thing, which is not proved, and therefore I shall not stand to their Courtesy, but briefly prove this also.

St. Paul tells us, *1 Cor. 2. 10. That the Spirit searcheth all things, yea the deep things of God:* So that the Holy Spirit knows all that is in God, even his most deep and secret Counsels, which is an argument, that he is very intimate with him; but this is not all, it is the manner of knowing, which must prove this consciousness, of which I speak; and that the Apostle adds in the next Verse, that the Spirit of God knows all that is in God, just as the Spirit of a Man

Holy and Ever Blessed TRINITY.

83

Man knows all that is in Man; that is, not by external revelation or communication of this knowledge, but by Self-consciousness, by an internal Sensation, which is owing to an essential Unity: *v. 11. For what man knoweth the things of a man, save the Spirit of a man which is in him; even so the things of God knoweth no man, but the Spirit of God.* So that the Spirit of God is as much within God, and as intimate to him, as the Spirit of Man is in Man; that is, by an essential Oneness, and Self-consciousness. And as the Spirit knoweth the deep things of God, so God who searcheth the hearts, knoweth the mind of the Spirit: *1 Cor. 2. 7.* So that the Father and the Holy Ghost are mutually conscious to each other, as a Man and his own Spirit are; and then we need not doubt, but the Holy Spirit, which is the Spirit of the Son, as well as of the Father, is as intimate to the Son also. And therefore Christ tells us of the Spirit, *He shall glorify me, for he shall receive of mine, and shall shew it unto you, all things that the Father hath are mine, therefore said I, he shall take of mine, and shall shew it unto you, 16 John 14. 15.* So that the Holy Spirit receives the things of Christ; But how does he receive them? Just as Christ receives them of the Father; the same things, and the same way; not by an external communication, but by an essential Oneness and Consciousness of all that is in the Father, and in the Son.

This seems to me to be the true Scripture account of the numerical Unity of the Divine Essence, and to make a Trinity in Unity as intelligible as the Notion of One God is; but because all that I have to say, turns upon this, I shall more particularly explain this Notion: 1. By shewing that this contains the true

K

Ortho-

Orthodox Faith of the Holy Trinity. 2. That it gives a plain and intelligible Solution of all the Difficulties and seeming Contradictions in the Doctrine of the Trinity.

I. This contains the true Orthodox Faith of the Holy Trinity, or a Trinity in Unity; for so the *Athanasian Creed* teaches us, *To worship One God in Trinity, and Trinity in Unity, neither confounding the Persons, nor dividing the Substance, for there is One Person of the Father, another of the Son, another of the Holy Ghost, but the Godhead of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost is all One, the Glory equal, the Majesty co-eternal.*

There are two things then, which an Orthodox Christian must take care of, neither to confound the Persons, nor to divide the Substance; that is, to acknowledge Three distinct Persons, and yet but One God; and nothing can be more apparent than both these, in that account which I have given of the Ever Blessed Trinity.

1. It is plain the Persons are perfectly distinct, for they are Three distinct and infinite Minds, and therefore Three distinct Persons; for a Person is an intelligent Being, and to say, they are Three Divine Persons, and not Three distinct infinite Minds, is both **Heresie** and **Nonsense**: The Scripture, I'm sure, represents Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, as Three intelligent Beings, not as Three Powers or Faculties of the same Being, which is down-right *Sabellianism*; for Faculties are not Persons, no more than Memory, Will, and Understanding, are Three Persons in One Man: When we prove the Holy Ghost to be a Person, against the *Socinians*, who make him only a Divine

vine Power, we prove, that all the Properties of a Person belong to him, such as Understanding, Will, Affections, and Actions; which shews, what our Notion of a Person is: Such a Being as has Understanding, and Will, and Power of Action; and it would be very strange, that we should own Three Persons, each of which Persons is truly and properly God, and not own Three infinite Minds; as if any thing could be a God, but an infinite Mind.

And the distinction between these Three Infinite Minds is plain according to this Notion; for they are distinguished, just as Three finite, and created Minds are, by Self-consciousness: They are united indeed into One (as I have already discoursed) by a mutual Consciousness to each other, which no created Spirits have, which are conscious only to the actings of their own Minds, not to each others: and therefore these Three Divine Persons are not separate Minds, as created Spirits are, but only distinct: each Divine Person has a Self consciousness of its own, and knows and feels itself (if I may so speak) as distinct from the other Divine Persons: the Father has a Self-consciousness of his own, whereby he knows and feels himself to be the Father, and not the Son, nor the Holy Ghost; and the Son in like manner feels himself to be the Son, and not the Father, nor the Holy Ghost; and the Holy Ghost feels himself to be the Holy Ghost, and not the Father, nor the Son; as *James* feels himself to be *James*, and not *Peter*, nor *John*: which proves them to be distinct Persons: Which is a very plain account, how these Three Divine Persons are distinct, that *there is One Father, not Three Fathers, One Son, not Three Sons, One Holy Ghost, not Three Holy Ghosts*. Here is no confounding of Persons.

2. Nor do we divide the Substance, but unite these Three Persons in One numerical Essence: for we know nothing of the unity of the Mind but self-consciousness, as I shewed before; and therefore as the self-consciousness of every Person to itself makes them distinct Persons, so the mutual consciousness of all Three Divine Persons to each other makes them all but One infinite God: as far as consciousness reaches, so far the Unity of a Spirit extends, for we know no other unity of a Mind or Spirit, but consciousness. In a created Spirit this consciousness extends only to itself, and therefore self-consciousness makes it One with itself, and divides and separates it from all other Spirits; but could this consciousness extend to other Spirits, as it does to itself, all these Spirits, which were mutually conscious to each other, as they are to themselves, though they were distinct Persons, would be essentially One: And this is that essential unity, which is between Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, who are essentially united by a mutual consciousness to whatever is in each other, and do by an internal sensation (I want other words to express it) feel each other, as they do themselves; and therefore are as essentially One, as a Mind and Spirit is One with itself.

2. This is a very plain and intelligible account of this great and venerable Mystery, as plain and intelligible as the Notion of One God, or of One Person in the Godhead.

The great difficulty of conceiving a Trinity of Persons in One infinite and undivided Essence or Substance, arises from those gross and material Ideas we have of Essence and Substance, when we speak of the Essence or Substance of God, or created Spirits:

We

We can frame no Idea of Substance, but what we have from Matter; that it is something extended in a tripple Dimension, in length, and breadth, and depth, which is the subject of those Qualities, which inhere and subsist in it: And therefore as Matter is the subject of all sensible Qualities, so we conceive some such Substance of a Mind and Spirit, which is the subject of Will and Understanding, of Thoughts and Passions: And then we find it impossible to conceive, how there should be Three Divine Persons, which are all infinite, without Three distinct infinite Substances, each distinct infinite Person having a distinct infinite Substance of his own; and if we grant this, it seems a plain contradiction to say, That these Three distinct infinite Substances, are but One numerical infinite Substance; which is to say, that Three Infinities are but One Infinite, and that Three Persons are but One Person; for a Person and an intelligent Substance are reciprocal Terms, and therefore Three distinct Persons are Three distinct numerical Substances, and One numerical intelligent Substance is but One numerical Person.

But this is all carnal Reason in a strict and proper sense, which conceives of an infinite Mind after the manner of a Body, and distinguishes between the Matter or Substance, and the Powers and Vertues of the Divine Essence, as it does between Matter and Qualities and Accidents in Bodies. We know nothing of the Divine Essence, but that God is an infinite Mind, and if we seek for any other Essence or Substance in God, but an infinite Mind; that is, infinite Wisdom, Power, and Goodness; the Essence of God, though considered but as One numerical Person, is as perfectly unintelligible to us, as the One numerical
Essence.

A Vindication of the Doctrine of the

Essence or Substance of Three Divine Persons in the Ever Blessed Trinity.

It is this gross and material imagination about the Essence and Substance of the Deity, which occasions all the Difficulties about the Notion of One God, as well as of a Trinity in Unity: For we cannot imagine, how any Substance should be without a beginning; how it should be present in all places without Parts, and without Extension; how Substance, Essence, Existence, and all Divine Attributes and Powers, which are distinct things in created Spirits, should be all the same, one simple Act in God: and yet Reason tells us we must allow of no Composition, no Qualities or Accidents in the Divine Nature; for a compounded Being must have Parts, and must be made; for that which has Parts must have some Maker to join the Parts together, and to endow it with such Qualities and Powers.

But now if we consider God as Wisdom and Truth, which is his true Nature and Essence, without confounding our Minds with some material conceptions of his Substance, these things are plain and easie: For it is demonstrable, that Truth is eternal, had no beginning, no Maker; for when we speak of original and essential Truth and Wisdom, what was not always Truth and Wisdom, could never begin to be so: And if Truth be the only real thing, and necessarily eternal, there is an eternal Mind, which is nothing else but eternal Truth; for he, who can imagine, Truth and Wisdom to be eternal, without an eternal Mind, ought not to pretend to either, unless he can tell us, how Truth can subsist without a Mind. Thus it is demonstrable, that Truth and Wisdom has no Parts, no Extension, no more than Thought has; Truth
and

and Wisdom is confined to no place, fills no space, but is every-where the same without Extension and Parts, and therefore has a necessary and essential Omnipresence: There is a faint resemblance of this in finite and created Spirits; even humane Wisdom and Reason, Thoughts and Passions, have no Extension nor Parts, which is a good argument that a created Spirit has no Extension nor Parts neither; for nothing which has Extension and Parts can be the subject of that which has none: All the Qualities of Bodies are extended as Bodies are; for the Properties and Qualities of all Things must conform to the Nature of the Subject in which they are; and therefore Faculties, Powers, and Operations, which have no Extension or Parts, [as the Will, the Understanding, the Memory, the Thoughts and Passions have none,] must be seated in a Subject which has no Parts nor Extension neither. Thus Thought is confined to no place, but in a Minute surrounds the Earth, and ascends above the Heavens, and visits all the empty Capacities of infinite space; which is an imperfect imitation of the Omnipresence of an Infinite Mind.

Thus what can be a more pure and simple Act than Wisdom and Truth? Now though we conceive the Divine Attributes and Perfections under different Notions and Characters, such as Wisdom, Love, Justice, Goodness, Power, they are indeed nothing else but Infinite Truth and Wisdom, which receives several Characters and Denominations from its different effects; as the same Sea or River does different Names from the Countries by which it passes: For what is intellectual Love, but the perfect Idea's of Truth, or the true knowledge and estimation of Things? What is Justice and Goodness, but an equal distribution of Things,

Things, or a true and wise proportion of Rewards and Punishments? What is perfect Power, but perfect Truth and Wisdom, which can do, whatever it knows? This last will not be so easily understood, because in Men we find Knowledge and Power to be very different things, that Men may know a great deal, which they cannot do: And yet if we consider this matter over again, we shall find it a mistake: For even among Men it is only Knowledge that is Power. Humane Power, and humane Knowledge, as that signifies a Knowledge how to do any thing, are commensurate; whatever humane Skill extends to, humane Power can effect; nay, every Man can do, what he knows how to do, if he have proper Instruments and Materials to do it with; but what no humane Power can do, no humane Knowledge knows how to do: We know not what the Substance or Essence of any thing is, nor can we make any Substance; we cannot create any thing of nothing, nor do we know, how it is to be done; which shews, that Knowledge and Power in Creatures are equal, and that proves a very near relation between them; especially when we add, that Knowledge is not only the Director of Power, but is that very Power which we call Force: For it is nothing but Thought which moves our Bodies, and all the Members of them, which are the immediate Instruments of all humane Force and Power: excepting Mechanical Motions, which do not depend upon our Wills, such as the motion of the Heart, the circulation of the Blood, the concoction of our Meat, and the like; all voluntary motions are not only directed, but caused by Thought; and so indeed it must be, or there could be no motion in the World, for Matter cannot move it self, and there

therefore some Mind must be the first Mover : which makes it very plain, that infinite Truth and Wisdom is Infinite and Almighty Power. So that if we set aside all material Images of Essence and Substance, and contemplate God as Eternal Truth and Wisdom, the Notion of a God is very plain and easie, as far as we are concerned to know him in this state.

The same cause has confounded and perplexed the Notion of a Trinity in Unity, and given occasion to some vain and arrogant Pretenders to Reason, profanely to deride and ridicule that most Sacred and Venerable Mystery.

They puzzle and confound themselves with some gross and corporeal Ideas of Essence and Substance, and how Three Divine Persons can subsist distinct in the same numerical Substance : but would they but consider the Three Divine Persons, as Three Infinite Minds, distinguished from each other by a self-consciousness of their own, and essentially united by a mutual consciousness to each other, which is the only way of distinguishing and uniting Minds and Spirits, and then a Trinity in Unity is a very plain and intelligible Notion.

Now certainly this is much the most reasonable way : For what the Essence and Substance of a Spirit is, when we distinguish it from Understanding and Will, which we call the Powers and Faculties of a Spirit, for my part, I know not, no more than I do, what the naked Essence and Substance of Matter is, stript of all its Qualities and Accidents : as I observed before, the naked Essences of Things are not the Objects of our Knowledge, and therefore it is ridiculous to dispute about them, to say peremptorily what is, or what is not, in matters, which we know nothing

A Vindication of the Doctrine of the

of : And therefore as we frame the Notion of Bodies from their external and sensible Qualities, so we must frame the Notion of a Spirit from its intellectual Powers, of Will, and Understanding, &c. and when we dispute about the distinction or union of Spirits, we must not dispute how their Substances, which we know nothing of, can be distinguished or united; but how two Minds considered as intellectual Beings, are distinguished and united, and then there will appear no difficulty or absurdity, in the essential union of Three Minds by a mutual consciousness to each other.

That the essential unity of a Spirit consists in self-consciousness, every man may feel in himself, for it is nothing else which makes a Spirit One, and distinguishes it from all other Spirits; and therefore if Two Spirits were conscious to all that is in each other, as they are to what they feel in themselves, they would be united to each other by the same kind of unity, which makes every individual Spirit One : And why then should not this be thought an essential unity between the Divine Persons of the ever Blessed Trinity.

And is there any difficulty in conceiving this, that Father, Son, and Holy Ghost should be thus intimately conscious to each other : The Scripture plainly asserts that it is so, as I have already proved, and there is no impossibility in the thing; nay, if we will allow Three infinite Minds, it is impossible, it should be otherwise.

A finite created Spirit indeed is conscious only to itself, and not to any other created Spirits; but God, who is an infinite Mind, is conscious to all created Spirits, dwells within-us, and sees all our Thoughts
and

and Motions, and Passions, as perfectly as we do our own; how he does this we know not, that he does so, the Scripture assures us, and that there is nothing impossible in it, our Reason will tell us; for certainly that infinite Mind, which made all finite Spirits, can see them too; that is, see all the Thoughts and Passions of a Spirit, which is the only way of seeing a Spirit; and that can be no infinite Mind which does not; for there is something, which it does not know, if it does not know our thoughts.

If then it be essential to an infinite Mind to be conscious to all Spirits, if we allow, that there are Three infinite Minds, we must grant, that they are mutually conscious to each other: though an infinite Mind is conscious to all that is in created Spirits, yet there is not a mutual consciousness, and therefore no essential unity between them, for created Spirits are not conscious to an infinite Mind, as it is impossible they should, unless they were infinite themselves; for a Mind which is conscious to an infinite Mind, that is, a Mind which comprehends an infinite Mind, must be infinite: But it is a contradiction to say, there are Three infinite Minds, unless they are mutually conscious to each other; for if there be any thing in one, which is not in the other, they cannot both be infinite, unless one infinite can be greater than another.

The truth is, we have no positive Notion of Infinity, but only in a Mind, and it is impossible to conceive any Three Beings that are infinite, but only Three infinite Minds; and Three Minds may be infinite, but then they must be mutually self-conscious, or they cannot all be infinite.

When we think of an infinite Being, we are presently confounded with the corporeal Images of an infinite Substance, or a Substance infinitely extended; and this we can make nothing of; for indeed it is demonstrable, that there can be no such thing. We have an imagination of infinite space, which we can set no bounds to, but how far soever we extend our thoughts, we can still imagine something beyond that; but then we have no Notion, that space is any thing, but only a capacity to receive something; nay, it seems to me, to be nothing else, but an imaginary Idea of Extension separated from Body and Matter; as we conceive place to be distinct from the Body, which fills the place, and therefore, that if the Body were annihilated, place would remain still of the same dimensions, which the Body had, that filled it; and this is the conception of an imaginary space infinitely extended. But it is as plain as any demonstration, that no real Being is infinitely extended; for there is, and can be no actual Extension infinite: The Extension of a real Being must really and actually be, and yet there is not a more self-evident Proposition than this, that there is no Extension so great but that it may be extended farther, and then there can be no such thing in being, as an infinite Extension, for if there were, there would be such an Extension, as could not be extended farther, unless we can extend that, which is actually infinite already. We may easily observe, what it is, that cheats us into the Opinion of infinite Extension, as if there were such a real thing: *viz.* That we cannot see to the end of all possible Extension, we cannot extend our thoughts so far, but we can imagine something farther, and therefore we fancy, that there is something infinitely

ex-

extended, though we cannot comprehend it, or see to the end of it, which would be a contradiction; to see to the end of that which has none: But we should observe, that it is not the defect of our imagination, that we cannot conceive an infinite Extension, but Reason tells us, that there neither is, nor can be, any such Extension, but what may be extended farther: now what cannot be, cannot be a real thing, for whatever is real, is.

It is exactly the same case in Numbers: there neither is, nor can be an infinite number, because there is no number so great, nor can any number be so great, but it may be made greater by adding to it; so that Numbers, Extension, and the same may be said of Time and Succession, are called infinite, not that they have any real and positive infinity, but because we can add to them without end, which is a demonstration, that they neither are, nor can be infinite, for what is infinite, is capable of no additions; and there can be no Number, Extension, or successive Duration, but what is capable of infinite additions; and therefore is at an infinite distance from being infinite.

By this time, I suppose every one is convinc'd, that infinite Extension does not belong to the Idea of a God, because there is no such thing in Nature; and if infinite Extension does not, no Extension can; for nothing is God, but what is infinite.

Though the truth is, this very word *infinite* confounds our Notions of God, and makes the most perfect and excellent Being, the most perfectly unknown to us: for infinite is only a negative term, and signifies that, which has no end, no bounds, no measure, and therefore no positive and determin'd Nature, and
therefore

therefore is nothing; that an *infinite Being*, had not use and custom reconciled us to that expression, would be thought Nonsense and Contradiction; for every real Being has a certain and determined Nature; and therefore is not infinite in this sense, which is so far from being a perfection, that it signifies nothing real.

But since Custom has made it necessary to use this word, it is necessary to explain what we mean by it: That an *infinite Being* signifies a Being absolutely perfect, or which has all possible Perfections: which has no other end of its Perfections, but Perfection itself; that is a finite imperfect Being, that wants any Perfections; that is an infinite Being, not which has no end of its Perfections, but which actually has all Perfections, and can be no more perfect than it is: For there is a measure of the most absolute, and in this sense infinite Perfections, before which no Being is absolutely perfect, and beyond which there are no new degrees of Perfection; for if we do not grant this, there can be no Being absolutely perfect.

As for Instance: Infinite Wisdom, Knowledge, Goodness, Justice, Power, have fixt and set bounds to their Perfections, beyond which they cannot go: Infinite Knowledge and Wisdom knows all things, that are knowable, and that are wise; infinite Goodness can do all things which are good; infinite Justice is perfect Justice, which observes the exact proportions of Right and Wrong; infinite Power can do all things which can be done; To know, what is not to be known, to do what is not to be done, to be good or just beyond the perfect measures of Goodness and Justice, is a contradiction; for it is neither Wisdom, nor Power, nor Goodness, nor Justice: The Nature
of

of Wisdom, Power, Justice, and Goodness, is fixt and determined, and the utmost bounds of them is absolute perfection : The Divine Nature is the Original Rule and Standard, and utmost bounds of them, and therefore absolutely perfect. These Perfections indeed may be called infinite in the Negative sense, with respect to us, that we know not, what the utmost extent of them are: We know not how far infinite Wisdom, and Power, and Goodness reaches, but then we certainly know, that they have their bounds, and that the Divine Nature is the utmost bounds of them; for nothing can be a Rule and Measure of absolute Perfections, but the Divine Nature itself: Now this gives us a positive Notion and Idea of God, though we cannot comprehend his absolute Perfections; we as certainly know, what God is, as we know, what Wisdom, Knowledge, Power, Goodness, Justice signifie, but how wise, how good, how powerful God is, we know not, because we do not know the utmost extent of these Perfections.

I must now add, that there can be no absolute Perfections, but those of a Mind, such as I have so often mentioned, Wisdom, Power, Goodness: As for Matter, it is so imperfect a Being itself, that it cannot be the subject of absolute Perfections: Nothing which belongs to Matter is a Perfection, considered in itself; Extension is no Perfection, no more than the dimensions of a Body are, to be long, or broad, or deep, to be little or great, which may be Perfections or Imperfections, as it happens, with relation to the just measures and proportions of different Bodies; for either greatness or littleness may make different things monstrous, and therefore neither of them are either Beauties or Perfections themselves; for what is in itself a Perfection, is always so.

Ex-

Extension is of no use, but where there is a multitude or diversity of Parts, and such a compound Being can never be absolutely perfect, because it is made of Parts, which are not absolutely perfect, as no Part can be; and ten thousand imperfect Parts can never make up an absolute perfect Being: And if what is infinitely perfect can have no Parts, it needs no Extension, and can have none; for what is extended has assignable Parts, whether they can be divided or not.

Omnipresence is a great and unquestionable Perfection, but to be Omnipresent by infinite Extension, (if such a thing could be) would be no Perfection at all; for this would be to be present only by Parts; as a Body might be, which is infinitely extended; and a Body is as capable of infinite Extension, as any Man can conceive a Spirit to be; and yet if a Spirit be Omnipresent only by infinite Extension, the whole Substance of that Spirit is not present every where, but part of it in one place, and part in another, as many Miles distant from each other as the places are, where such parts of the Omnipresent Spirit are. This all Men will confess to be absurd; and yet if the whole Mind and Spirit be present every where, it is certain, it is not present every where by way of Extension; for the whole Extension of an infinitely extended Spirit is not present every where: And if Omnipresence itself cannot be owing to infinite Extension, no Man can tell me, why an infinite Mind should be extended at all: For Extension itself is no Perfection. Much less do any other Vertues and Qualities of Bodies deserve the Name of Absolute Perfections, and therefore we must seek for Absolute Perfection only in a Mind; perfect Wisdom, Knowledge, Power, Goodness,

ness, Justice, make an absolute perfect Mind; there are no other absolute Perfections but these, and therefore there can be no other absolutely perfect Being, but an infinite Mind.

But besides this we may observe, that all these absolute Perfections, by a mutual consciousness may be entire and equal in three distinct infinite Minds: There is no contradiction, that three infinite Minds should be absolutely perfect in Wisdom, Goodness, Justice, and Power; for these are Perfections, which may be in more than One, as Three Men may all know the same things, and be equally just and good: but Three such Minds cannot be absolutely perfect without being mutually conscious to each other, as they are to themselves; for if they do not perfectly know each other, as they know themselves, their Wisdom and Knowledge is not absolutely perfect; for they do not know all things, if they do not perfectly know one another; and there can be no such perfect knowledge of each other, without a mutual consciousness.

This shews not only the possibility of this Notion, that Three distinct infinite Minds should be mutually conscious to each other, but the necessity of it, if there be Three such infinitely perfect Minds; for they cannot be infinitely perfect, without being conscious to one another.

Thus to proceed: This Notion plainly reconciles the perfect equality of all Three Persons, with the Prerogative of the Father, and the Subordination of the Son and Holy Spirit. That all Three persons are perfectly equal in Knowledge, Wisdom, Goodness, Justice, Power, is evident from their mutual consciousness, whereby they all know, love, and do

the same things, which is a perfect equality: But this does not destroy the natural Subordination of the Son to the Father, of a derivative to an original Light, as Christ is called in the *Nicene Creed*; *God of God, Light of Light*: For though God has communicated his own Nature to him, and received him into his Bosom, to an intimate consciousness with himself, which makes him the perfect Image of his Father; yet he receives all this from his Father by eternal Generation, he is a Son still, though equal to his Father in all Divine Perfections, and therefore subordinate to him as a Son: and the like may be said of the Holy Spirit.

This shews also, how these Three distinct Persons are each of them God, and yet are all but One God. Each Person is God, for each Person has the whole and entire Perfections of the Godhead, having by this mutual consciousness, the other Persons in himself, that each Person is in some sense the whole Trinity: The Son is in the Father, and the Father in the Son, and the Holy Spirit in Father and Son, and Father and Son in the Holy Spirit; and therefore if the whole Trinity be God, the Father is God, the Son is God, and the Holy Ghost God, they being all mutually in each other; and yet this is a plain demonstration, that they are not Three Gods, but One God; because neither of them are the One Supreme God, but as thus intimately united to all the rest; and then they can be all Three, but One Supreme God: This gives an intelligible account of one of the most difficult Problems in all School-Divinity, which the Master of the Sentences borrowed from St. *Austin* as he has done most of his other Distinctions; that the whole Trinity is not greater, than any One Person
in

in the Trinity. This sounds very harshly at first hearing, and yet if we consider it, we must confess it to be true, unless we will say, that there is a greater and less in God; or that the Three Persons in the Trinity make One God, as Three parts make a whole, each of which parts must be less than the whole; and yet I cannot see any possible way to understand this matter, but only this: That the whole Trinity by a mutual consciousness is in each person, and therefore no Person is less than the whole Trinity.

And this is the only possible way of understanding the different *Modi subsistendi*, of which the Schools speak; That the Three Divine Persons have One numerical Essence, and are One God, but are distinguished from each other by a distinct manner of Subsistence proper to each Person: It is plain, the Schoolmen were no *Sabellians*; they did not think the Three Divine Persons, to be only Three Names of the same infinite Being; but acknowledged each Person to be really distinct from one another, and each of them to have the same numerical Essence, and to be truly and properly God, and not to be Three Modes of the same infinite God, which is little better than Three Names of One God.

And what are these *Modi subsistendi*, by which the Divine Persons are distinguished from each other? Now they are no other, than the proper and distinguishing Characters of each Person; that the Father is of himself, or without any cause; that the Son is begotten of the Father, that the Holy Ghost proceeds from Father and Son: Which proves that by these *Modi subsistendi*, they did not mean (as some mistake them) that the Three Divine Persons are Three Modes of the Deity, or only modally distinguished,

for there are no Modes, no more than there are Qualities and Accidents, in the Deity, much less can a Mode be a God: To be sure, all Men must grant, that the Father is not a Mode of the Deity, but essentially God, and yet he has his *Modus subsistendi*, as well as the Son, and the Holy Ghost; and no Man can think, that the Father begat only a *Modus*, and called it his Son, whereas a Son signifies a real Person of the same Nature, but distinct from his Father.

All then that can possibly be meant by these Modes of Subsistence is this, that the same numerical Essence is whole and entire in each Divine Person, but in a different manner; the Son and Holy Ghost are in the Father, as the One is begotten, the other proceeds from him, and yet both remain in him by an intimate consciousness; and thus you have often heard, all Three Persons are in each other, and therefore are numerically One; the Father has the Son and Holy Ghost in himself as the Fountain of the Deity, the Son begotten of the Father, the Holy Ghost Proceeding from Father and Son. That is, there are Three infinite Minds, which are distinguished from each other by the relations of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, the Father begets, the Son is begotten, the Holy Ghost proceeds, which are three different Modes of subsisting; but each of these infinite Minds has the other Two in himself, by an intimate and mutual consciousness, and that makes all Three Persons numerically One Divine Essence, or One God; for when the whole Trinity is in each distinct Person, each Person is the same One numerical God, and all of them but One God: If the Father, for instance, have his own personal Wisdom, and by an internal
con-

consciousness, all the Wisdom of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; and the Son have his own personal Wisdom, and by the same consciousness, all the Wisdom of the Father, and the Holy Ghost; and in like manner, the Holy Ghost have his own personal Wisdom, and all the Wisdom of Father, and Son; this infinite Wisdom which is in Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, is identically the same: for from which Person soever you begin to reckon this Union, it is the same Father, Son, and Holy Ghost still, which are thus intimately united into One; and therefore it is the same numerical and identical Wisdom, which is in each of them, and the same in all.

To add no more: This Notion gives a plain account too of that Maxim of the Schools, That all the Operations of the Trinity, *ad extra*, are common to all Three Persons; for it cannot possibly be otherwise, when they are thus intimately united by a mutual consciousness; for they can no more act, than they can subsist separately; when the Wisdom, Goodness, Justice, Power of the whole Trinity is entire in each Person, and the same in all, every Person of the Trinity must be equally concerned, saving the Natural Order, and Subordination of Persons, in all the external Effects and Operations of the Divine Wisdom, Justice, Goodness, and Power.

Thus I have endeavoured to explain this Great and Venerable Mystery of a Trinity in Unity; and this I may say, that I have given not only a very possible and a very intelligible Notion of it, but such also as is very agreeable to the phrase and expressions of Scripture, such as preserves the Majesty of the Article, and solves all the Difficulties of it; there may be a great

great deal more in this Mystery, than we can fathom, but thus much we can understand of it, and that is enough to reconcile us to this belief, and to shame and silence the profane Scoffers at a Trinity in Unity; as I have in part shewn already, and will do now more fully, by proceeding to answer those many Absurdities and Contradictions charged on it by the *Brief Notes*: To proceed then where I left off.

Creed. *There is One Person of the Father, another of the Son, another of the Holy Ghost.*

Notes. *Then the Son is not the Father, nor is the Father the Son, nor the Holy Ghost either of them.*

Answer. I grant it: their Persons are distinct, and therefore are not each other, but they are all essentially united by a mutual consciousness, whereby they are mutually in each other, and can be no more separated from each other, than every Man's own mind can be divided from itself.

Notes. *But if the Father is not the Son, and yet is (by confession of all) the One true God, then the Son is not the One true God, because he is not the Father: The reason is self-evident, for how can the Son be the One true God, if he be not He, who is the One true God. After the same manner it may be proved, that (on the Athanasian Principles) neither the Father, nor Holy Spirit, are, or can be God, or the One true God; for neither of them is the Son, who is the One true God, according to Athanasius, and all Trinitarians; for they all say, The Father is the One true God, the Son is the*

One

One true God, and the Holy Ghost the One true God ; which is a threefold contradiction, because there is but One true God, and One of these Persons is not the other. But if it be a Contradiction it is certainly false, for every Contradiction, being made up of Inconsistencies, destroys it self, and is its own Confutation.

This is meer trick and fallacy, or misrepresentation. *Answer.* To have made his Argument conclude, he should have said : The Father is not the Son, and yet the Person of the Father considered not only as distinguished, but as divided and separated from the Person of the Son, is the One true God, and then the Son is not the One true God, because he is not the Father : And then indeed his reason had been self-evident, that the Person of the Son, as separated from the Person of the Father, is not the One true God, because the Person of the Son is not the Person of the Father, who is the One true God : But neither *Athanasius*, nor any of the *Trinitarians* ever said this, That the Person of the Father, as separated from the Persons of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, is the One true God ; or that the Person of the Son as separated from the Persons of the Father, and of the Holy Ghost is the One true God ; or that the Person of the Holy Ghost as separated from the Persons of the Father, and of the Son, is the One true God ; for we constantly affirm, that Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, by an intimate and inseparable Union to each other, are but One true God ; but as their Persons can never be separated, so they must never be considered in a separate state, and if we will imagine such an impossible absurdity as this, neither of them are the One true God, for whoever separates them, destroys the Deity, and leaves neither Father, Son, nor Holy Ghost. And

And yet if we consider these Three Divine Persons, as containing each other in themselves, and essentially One by a mutual consciousness, this pretended Contradiction vanishes: For then the Father is the One true God, because the Father has the Son, and the Holy Spirit in himself; and the Son may be called the One true God (of which more presently) because the Son has the Father, and the Holy Ghost in himself; and the Holy Ghost the One True God, because he has the Father and the Son in himself, and yet all but One true God, because Father, Son, and Holy Ghost are united into One; and then though *One of these Persons is not the other*, yet each Person by an essential unity contains both others in himself, and therefore if all Three Persons are the One true God, each Person is God.

And this is the true meaning of the *Athanasian Creed*, which this Author has corrupted by adding, *the One true God* to every Person; that *the Father is the One true God, the Son the One true God, the Holy Ghost the One true God*, as if each Person as distinguished and separated from the other, were the One true God; and then it would indeed sound pretty like a Contradiction to add, yet there is but One true God: But the *Athanasian Creed* only says, *The Father is God, the Son God, the Holy Ghost God; yet Three are not Three Gods, but One God*; which plainly shews, that it does not speak of these Three Divine Persons, as distinguished and separated from each other; but as united into One God, not as Three parts of the Deity, but as Three Persons, who are essentially One God, as mutually containing each other, that is, by a mutual self-consciousness, as I have now explained it, which is the essential Unity of a Mind.

As

As for this expression, *The One true God*, it is never attributed to Son, or Holy Ghost, that I know of either in Scripture, or any Catholick Writer; tho' it is to the Father, whom our Saviour himself calls, *The only true God*; for all Three Divine Persons as in conjunction with each other, being *the One only true God*: This Title cannot so properly be attributed to any One Person, but only the Father, who is the Fountain of the Deity: for though all Three Persons are in each other by a mutual consciousness, and therefore each Person has all the Perfections of the Godhead; yet the Son is in the Father, and the Holy Spirit in the Father and the Son, in such a manner as the Father is not in the Son, nor the Father and Son in the Holy Spirit, which the Schools call the *Modi subsistendi*; that is, the Son is in the Father by eternal generation, and the Holy Spirit in Father and Son by eternal procession; and this is the natural Order of the Trinity; and therefore when this One God is to be signified by the Name of any One Person, it is proper to follow the Order of Nature, if I may so speak, and to signifie the whole Sacred Trinity by the Name of the Father, who is the eternal Source and Fountain of it.

The Godhead of the Father, and of the Son, and of Creed. the Holy Ghost is all One, the Glory equal, the Majesty coeternal.

The meaning of the last clause is, that the Glory Notes. and Majesty of the Son and Holy Spirit is equal to the Glory and Majesty of the Father, or the Son and Holy Spirit are equally Glorious and Majestical with God the Father.

N

Therefore

A Vindication of the Doctrine of the

Therefore I ask, whether the Glory and Majesty with which the Son and Spirit are Glorious and Majestical be the same in number (that is, the very same) with which the Father is Glorious and Majestical, or only the same for kind or degree? If it be not the same in number, then the Godhead of the Father, and of the Son, is not (as this Creed teaches) all One, and they are not One and the same God: for Two infinite and distinct Glories and Majesties make Two Gods, and Three make Three Gods; as every one sees, and (to say true) the Trinitarians themselves confess. It remains therefore that they say, That the Glory and Majesty of the Son and Spirit is the same in number and not for kind and degree only, with that of the Father; but then it follows, that the Glory and Majesty of these Persons is neither equal, nor coeternal. Not equal, for 'tis the same, which equals never are. Not coeternal, for this also plainly intimates, that they are distinct; For how coeternal, if not distinct? Do we say, a thing is coeternal and cotemporary with itself? Therefore also this Article doth impugn and destroy itself: Besides, if the Glory and Majesty of the Three Persons be numerically the same, then so are all their other Attributes: from whence it follows, that there is not any real difference between the Three Persons, and they are only Three several Names of God, which is the Heresie of the Sabellians.

Answer.

What he says, That if the Glory and Majesty of the Three Persons be numerically the same, so are all their other Attributes, is certainly true; for their Glory and Majesty is nothing else, but the infinite Perfections of their Nature. And therefore to make short work with this, I affirm, that the Glory and Majesty,

Holy and Ever Blessed TRINITY.

92

fly, and all the other perfections of these Three Divine Persons are as distinct as their Persons are, and therefore may be coequal and coeternal, because they are distinct, and yet they are as numerically One and the same as the Godhead is. They are Three Infinite Minds, and therefore distinct as Three Minds are, but they are all mutually conscious to each other, and therefore as essentially One, as the same Mind is One with itself by a self-consciousness; this does not destroy the Distinction of their Persons, nor consequently of their Majesty and Glory: their Glory and Majesty is as distinct as their Persons are, and united as their Persons are, into One essential and numerical Glory of one Supreme God, a Trinity in Unity.

But to expose the ridiculous Sophistry of this, instead of *their Glory equal, their Majesty coeternal*, let us put in their Persons equal and coeternal: for the equality of their Glory, and coeternity of their Majesty, is nothing else, but the equality and coeternity of their Persons; that *the Godhead of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost is all One, their Persons equal and coeternal*. And then our Note-makers Argument runs thus:

“ I ask, whether the Persons of the Son, and of
 “ the Holy Ghost, which are equal and coeternal
 “ with the Person of the Father, be the same in num-
 “ ber (that is, the very same) with the Person of the
 “ Father, or only the same for kind and degree? If
 “ they be not the same in number (that is, if they
 “ be distinct Persons, (as the Creed affirms) then
 “ the Godhead of the Father, and of the Son, is not
 “ all One, and they are not One and the same God,

N 2

“ for

A Vindication of the Doctrine of the

Therefore I ask, whether the Glory and Majesty with which the Son and Spirit are Glorious and Majestical be the same in number (that is, the very same) with which the Father is Glorious and Majestical, or only the same for kind or degree? If it be not the same in number, then the Godhead of the Father, and of the Son, is not (as this Creed teaches) all One, and they are not One and the same God: for Two infinite and distinct Glories and Majesties make Two Gods, and Three make Three Gods; as every one sees, and (to say true) the Trinitarians themselves confess. It remains therefore that they say, That the Glory and Majesty of the Son and Spirit is the same in number and not for kind and degree only, with that of the Father; but then it follows, that the Glory and Majesty of these Persons is neither equal, nor coeternal. Not equal, for 'tis the same, which equals never are. Not coeternal, for this also plainly intimates, that they are distinct: For how coeternal, if not distinct? Do we say, a thing is coeternal and cotemporary with itself? Therefore also this Article doth impugn and destroy itself: Besides, if the Glory and Majesty of the Three Persons be numerically the same, then so are all their other Attributes: from whence it follows, that there is not any real difference between the Three Persons, and they are only Three several Names of God, which is the Heresie of the Sabellians.

Answer.

What he says, That if the Glory and Majesty of the Three Persons be numerically the same, so are all their other Attributes, is certainly true; for their Glory and Majesty is nothing else, but the infinite Perfections of their Nature. And therefore to make short work with this, I affirm, that the Glory and Majesty,

Holy and Ever Blessed TRINITY.

92

sty, and all the other perfections of these Three Divine Persons are as distinct as their Persons are, and therefore may be coequal and coeternal, because they are distinct, and yet they are as numerically One and the same as the Godhead is. They are Three Infinite Minds, and therefore distinct as Three Minds are, but they are all mutually conscious to each other, and therefore as essentially One, as the same Mind is One with itself by a self-consciousness; this does not destroy the Distinction of their Persons, nor consequently of their Majesty and Glory: their Glory and Majesty is as distinct as their Persons are, and united as their Persons are, into One essential and numerical Glory of one Supreme God; a Trinity in Unity.

But to expose the ridiculous Sophistry of this, instead of *their Glory equal, their Majesty coeternal*, let us put in their Persons equal and coeternal: for the equality of their Glory, and coeternity of their Majesty, is nothing else, but the equality and coeternity of their Persons; that *the Godhead of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost is all One, their Persons equal and coeternal*. And then our Note-makers Argument runs thus:

“ I ask, whether the Persons of the Son, and of
 “ the Holy Ghost, which are equal and coeternal
 “ with the Person of the Father, be the same in num-
 “ ber (that is, the very same) with the Person of the
 “ Father, or only the same for kind and degree? If
 “ they be not the same in number (that is, if they
 “ be distinct Persons, (as the Creed affirms) then
 “ the Godhead of the Father, and of the Son, is not
 “ all One, and they are not One and the same God,

“ for Two infinite and distinct Persons make Two
 “ Gods, and Three make Three Gods. Is not this
 now, a self-evident proof, that there cannot be One
 Godhead, if there be Three Persons, because Three
 Persons make Three Gods! *Quod erat demonstrandum*;
 that is, it cannot be, because it cannot be: But to pro-
 ceed with his argument.

“ It remains therefore, that these *Trinitarians* say,
 “ That the Person of the Son and Spirit, is the same
 “ in number, and not in kind or degree only, with
 “ the Person of the Father. That is, because they
 affirm these Divine Persons to be distinct, therefore
 they must say, they are numerically the same; and
 what then? Why then they are neither equal, nor
 coeternal, because they are the same without any real
 distinction, and the same thing is not equal, nor
 coeternal with itself: Right! very right Sir! a plain
 demonstration! And thus the poor *Trinitarians* are
 eternally confounded! They teach, that there are
 Three distinct Persons, and One eternal and infinite
 God; he plainly confutes this by saying, That if there
 be One Godhead, there cannot be Three distinct Per-
 sons, for Three distinct Persons are Three Gods; and
 if he had proved it, as well as said it, it had been a di-
 rect confutation. They affirm, that these Three dis-
 tinct Persons are coequal and coeternal; he proves,
 that they are not, because they must say, (though
 they say the quite contrary) that they are not Three,
 but One numerical Person, and then they cannot be
 coequal and coeternal: and thus they shamefully
 contradict themselves, and this Article is *Felo de se*:
 If this be the profound Reason of Hereticks, God de-
 liver me from Heresie, if it were for no other Reason,
 but to keep my Understanding: And yet as ridicu-
 lous

lous as this looks, it is the whole of his Reasoning; for if there be Three distinct coequal and coeternal Persons, their Majesty and Glory must be as distinct, coequal, coeternal, as their Persons are, and united into One numerical essential Glory, as their Persons are into One God; and how Three infinite Minds, or the Three Divine Persons, or, which is the same thing, Three Divine Glories and Majesties may be really distinct, and yet numerically One God, I have already explained at large.

In the next place, this Creed teaches, That, "The Creed.
 " Father is Incomprehensible, Uncreate, Eternal, Al-
 " mighty; the Holy Ghost is Incomprehensible, Un-
 " create, Eternal, Almighty: Also, That each of
 " these Persons is by himself God and Lord; so that
 " the Father is God, the Son is God, and the Holy
 " Ghost is God: yet there are not Three Gods, or
 " Lords, nor Three Incomprehensibles, nor Three
 " Almightyes, nor Three Eternals, nor Uncreated.

Now if in imitation of this, a Man should have a Notes
 mind to say: "The Father is a Person, the Son is a
 " Person, and the Holy Ghost is a Person; yet not
 " Three Persons, but One Person; I would know,
 why this were not as good Grammer and Arithmetick,
 as when Athanasius says, The Father is God, the Son is
 God, and the Holy Ghost is God, yet not Three Gods,
 but One God; or when he says, The Father Uncreated,
 the Son Uncreated, the Holy Ghost Uncreated, yet
 not Three Uncreated, but One Uncreated. And so of
 the rest?

Doth not a Man contradict himself, when the Term
 or Terms in his Negation, are the same with those in
 his

A Vindication of the Doctrine of the

his Affirmation? If not, then it may be true, That "The Father is a Person; the Son is a Person, the Holy Ghost is a Person, yet there are not Three Persons, but One Person: For all the fault here is only this, that in the last clause the term Person is denied to belong to more than One, when in the first it had been affirmed of no fewer than Three. For the same reason it must be a Contradiction to say, "The Father is God, the Son is God, the Holy Ghost is God, yet there are not Three Gods, but One God: For the Term God is at last denied to belong to more than One, though in the first clause, it was affirmed of Three: Will they say, that in these words there are not Three Gods but One God, the term God is not denied to belong to more than One, or is not appropriated to One? If so, then there are not three Persons, but One Person; and again, there are not Three Men, but One Man; then I say, these Propositions do not deny the terms Person and Men to belong to more than One, or appropriate them to One only, which yet every Body confesses they do.

Answer.

This Objection sounds very formidably too, but proves nothing but the shameful Ignorance and impudence of this Author, who undertakes to write Notes upon Creeds, and to ridicule the Venerable Mysteries of the Christian Faith, before he understands them.

For let us begin with the Adjectives first, such as Uncreated, Incomprehensible, Eternal, Almighty; and we need take under consideration, but any One of these, and that will explain all the rest, for there is the same account to be given of them all.

The

The Father then is Uncreated, the Son Uncreated, the Holy Ghost Uncreated; and yet there are not Three Uncreated, but One Uncreated? Now to make this a Contradiction, that there are Three, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, Uncreated; and yet that there are not Three Uncreated, but One Uncreated; this term *Uncreated* must be applied to the same subject, and affirmed and denied in the same sense: Now when Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, are said to be Uncreated, this term *Uncreated* is applied to the Three Divine Persons, and if Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, are Uncreated, it is certain, there are Three Divine Persons *Uncreated*; and had it been said in the Creed, that there are not Three Divine Persons Uncreated, it had been as plain a Contradiction, as to say, *That the Father is a Person, the Son a Person, and the Holy Ghost a Person, and yet there are not Three Persons, but one Person*: Thus far our Author and I agree: But wherein then do we differ? For is it not expressly said in the Creed, that though the Father is Uncreated, the Son Uncreated, the Holy Ghost Uncreated, which are plainly Three Uncreated, if Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, are Three; yet there are not Three Uncreated, but One Uncreated? I grant it; but if our Author had understood any *Greek* or *Latin*, he should have made a little use of it here, and then he would have found, that the Creed of *Athanasius* had not denied, that there were Three Uncreated Persons, and therefore did not contradict, what it had before affirmed, that the Three Persons of the Sacred Trinity are all Uncreated. For *τρεῖς ἄκτιστοι*, and *tres In creati*, cannot signify Three Uncreated Persons, as it must do to make it a Contradiction; for though there is no Substantive expressed,

fed, yet ſome muſt be underſtood, and *ἄκτιστος*, and *Increati* will not agree with *περὶ ὁμοῦ πατρὸς*, or *Personæ*, and therefore *Sto*, and *Di* muſt be underſtood; that is, though there are Three Uncreated Perſons, Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt; yet there are not Three Uncreated Gods, but One Uncreated God, which is no more a Contradiſtion, than to ſay, that though there are Three Divine Perſons, there are not Three, but One God.

And that this is the true meaning of the Article, appears from the whole ſcope and deſign of it. I ſhall inſtance only in the concluſion, which contains the Reaſon of the whole, why though all Three Perſons are Uncreated, Incomprehenſible, Eternal, Almighty, God, and Lord; yet we muſt not ſay, that there are Three, but One Eternal, Incomprehenſible, Uncreated, Almighty, God, and Lord: *For like as we are compelled by the Chriſtian Verity; to acknowledge every Perſon by himſelf to be God and Lord, and there is the ſame reaſon for Eternal, Uncreate, &c. So are we forbidden by the Catholick Religion, to ſay, There are Three Gods, or Three Lords, Three Eternals, Incomprehenſibles, Uncreated, Almightyes. Which plainly proves, that when the Creed denies, that there are Three Eternals, or Three Uncreated, it does not deny, that there are Three Eternal and Uncreated Perſons, but that there are Three Eternal and Uncreated Gods, which is not like ſaying, there are no Three Perſons, but One Perſon; but theſe Three Eternal Perſons are not Three Eternal Gods, but One Eternal God.*

This is a ſufficient Answer with relation to the Adjectives of Eternal, Uncreate, Incomprehenſible, Almighty, that if you joyn them with Perſon, there are

are Three Eternal, Uncreated Persons, but if you joyn them with God, there are not Three Eternal, Uncreated Gods, but One Eternal Uncreated God; and this is no more a contradiction, than to say, there are Three Persons and but One God; but what shall we say to the term GOD, which is ascribed to all Three Persons; and yet the Creed affirms, that though there are Three Persons, each of which is God, yet there are not Three Gods, but One. God? That is, *the term God is affirmed of Three, and yet denied to belong to more than One*; And is not this a Contradiction? I answer, No, unless this term God be attributed to Three divided and separated Persons; for if Three such seperated Persons be each of them God, they must be Three Gods, and it would be a Contradiction to say, that Three Persons which are divided and separated from each other, are each of them God, and yet that there are not Three Gods, but One God: But if these Three distinct Persons are not separated, but essentially united into One, each of them may be God, and all Three but One God: for if these Three Persons, each of whom *procedit* as it is in the Creed, singly by himself, not seperately from the other Divine Persons, is God and Lord, are essentially united into One, there can be but One God and One Lord, and how each of these Persons is God, and all of them but One God, by their mutual consciousness, I have already explained.

That *Salvo* he has found out for the *Trinitarians*, of this pretended Contradiction of Three Gods, and One God; that there are *Three personal Gods*, and but *One essential God*, is so senseless, and the Paragraph so long, that I shall not give my self the trouble of transcribing it: for the Answer lies in a few words.

We grant there are Three Persons, each of whom is God; but we deny, that there are *Three personal Gods*: because though their Persons are distinct, they never were, and never can be divided and separated; and therefore can be but One God, being essentially united into One: by *Three Gods* all Mankind understand, Three distinct and separate Beings, independent on One another, each of which is a Supreme and Sovereign God, as Three separate humane Persons are Three Men; but where the Persons are not separated, but essentially united into One, there we must acknowledge but One God.

But you'll say: Though the Union of their Persons will not allow us to say, that there are Three separate personal Gods, yet if all Three Persons are distinct, though not separated from each other, and each of them is God considered *μωαδιὰς*, as distinct, though not separate from the other Divine Persons, then at least the Godhead of each Person must be as distinct as their Persons are, and we must acknowledge three distinct, though not separate Gods. I answer, by no means. We must allow each Person to be a God, but each distinct Person is not a distinct God; there is but One Godhead, which can no more be distinguished, then it can be divided from it self. There is but One God; and each Divine Person is this One numerical God, has the whole entire Godhead in himself, and the same One numerical Godhead is in them all; thus each Divine Person is God, and all of them but the same One God; as I explained it before.

This One Supream God is Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, a Trinity in Unity, Three Persons, and One God: Now Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, with all their

their Divine Attributes and Perfections (excepting their personal Properties, which the Schools call the *Modi subsistendi*, that One is the Father, the other the Son, the other the Holy Ghost, which cannot be communicated to each other) are whole and entire in each Person by a mutual consciousness, each Person feels the other Persons in himself, all their essential Wisdom, Power, Goodness, Justice, as he feels himself, and this makes them essentially One, as I have proved at large. Now if the whole Trinity be in each Divine Person by such an intimate and essential Union, we must confess each Person to be God, if the whole Trinity be God: and yet there being but One Trinity, One Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, who are essentially One by a mutual consciousness, it is certain all these Three Divine Persons can be but One God: for where-ever you begin to reckon, there are but Three, and these Three are One: If we consider the Father and Holy Ghost in the Son by this mutual consciousness; we truly affirm the Son to be God, as having all the Divine Perfections of the whole Trinity in himself; if we consider the Father and the Son in the Holy Ghost; for the same reason we affirm the Holy Ghost to be God; but the natural Order of the Trinity is to reckon from the Father as the Fountain of the Deity: that Father, Son, and Holy Ghost are One God: for the Son and Holy Spirit are in the Father, not only by a mutual consciousness, as the Father and the Son are in the Holy Ghost, but as in their Cause, (if I may so speak, and the Ancient Fathers were not afraid to speak so) as in their Root, their Origine, their Fountain, from whence they receive the communications of the Divine Essence, and Godhead; the Son by Eternal Generation, being God of God, Light

of Light ; the Holy Ghost by Eternal Proceſſion from the Father and the Son. Thus all theſe Divine Perſons are naturally united in the Father , who is the Fountain of the Deity, and all eſſentially in each other by a mutual conſciouſneſs, which makes each Perſon God, and all One and the ſame God without any ſhew of Contradiſtion.

S E C T. V.

The Doctrine of the Fathers, and of the Schools, concerning the Diſtinction of Perſons, and the Unity of Eſſence in the Ever Bleſſed Trinity, conſidered and reconciled to the foregoing Explication of it.

THIS Notion of the Union of the Divine Perſons in One numerical Eſſence, by a mutual conſciouſneſs to each other, is ſo very plain, and gives ſo eaſie and intelligible an account both of the Phraſes of Scripture, and all other Difficulties in the Doctrine of the Trinity, that this alone is ſufficient to reconcile any Man to it : but I am very ſenſible, how afraid Men are (and not without reaſon) of any new Explications of ſo Venerable a Myſtery, and ſuch a Fundamental Doctrine of Chriſtianity ; as this is ; and therefore I muſt ward this blow, as well as I can, and remove the prejudice of Novelty and Innovation. Now if it appear, that I have advanced no new Propoſition, but have confined myſelf to the received Faith and Doctrine of the Catholick Church ; if that Explication I have given of it, contain nothing new, but what is univerſally acknowledged, though poſſibly not in expreſs terms applied to that purpoſe I uſe it for ; if that explication I have given be very con-

consistent with, nay, be the true interpretation of that account the Ancients give of a Trinity in Unity, I hope it will not be thought an unpardonable Novelty, if I have expressed the same thing in other words, which give us a more clear and distinct apprehension of it : and to satisfy all men, that it is so, I shall compare, what I have now said concerning the Distinction of Persons, and the Unity of Essence in the Ever Blessed Trinity, with the Doctrine of the Fathers, and the Schools.

I. To begin then with the distinction of Persons. I have not indeed troubled my Readers with the different signification of Essence, and Hypostasis, Substance, Subsistence, Person, Existence, Nature, &c. which are terms very differently used by *Greek* and *Latin* Fathers in this Dispute, and have very much obscured this Doctrine instead of explaining it; but I plainly assert, That as the Father is an eternal and infinite Mind, so the Son is an eternal and infinite Mind, distinct from the Father, and the Holy Ghost is an eternal and infinite Mind, distinct both from Father and Son; which every body can understand without any skill in Logick or Metaphysics: And this is no new Notion, but the constant Doctrine both of the Fathers and Schools. Three Persons signify Three, who are infinite in Knowledge and Wisdom, and all other Perfections, which belong to a Mind: Now no Man who acknowledges a Trinity of Persons, ever denied that the Son and the Holy Spirit, were intelligent Beings or Minds.

When they tell us, (which is their common Language) that the Son is the substantial Word and
-Wif-

Wisdom of the Father, what is this else but to say, that he is an intelligent Being, or infinite Mind: Greg. Nyssen calls the Son, or Word, *λογος* τὸ *χρῆμα*, Mind, or Intellect. Athanasius observes from our

Ὁ κύριος Ἰησοῦς δὲ εἶπεν, ὅτι καὶ Πάτερ ἐγώ εἰμι καὶ ὁ Πατήρ ἐν ἑαυτῷ, καὶ τὸ αὐτὸν πνεῦμα παρὲς ἑαυτοῦ ἐν τῷ ἁγίῳ τῷ ᾧ ἐστὶν ἰσχύς. Athanas. Cont. Arium. Disput. Tom. 1. p. 116. Paris. 1627.

Saviour's words, *I and my Father are One*; that *are* signifies two, or the distinction of Persons, as *One* signifies the Unity

of Essence: for he does not say, *I and my Father am*, but *are One*. And therefore if the Father be an eternal Mind and Wisdom, the Son also is an eternal, but begotten Mind and Wisdom; as the Nicene Creed tells us, That he is *God of God, Light of Light, very God of very God*. St. Austin in his Sixth Book of the Trinity, takes notice of a common argument used by the Orthodox Fathers against the *Arians*, to prove the coeternity of the Son with the Father; that if the Son be the

Wisdom and Power of God, as St. Paul teaches, *1 Cor. 1.* and God was never without his Wisdom and Power, the Son must be coeternal with the Father; for it is distraction to say, that the Father was ever without his Wisdom, or Power, was neither wise nor powerful. But this acute Father discovered a great inconvenience in this argument, for it forces us to say, that the Father is not wise,

but by that Wisdom which he begot, not being himself Wisdom as the Father: and then we must consider, whether the Son himself, as he is God of God, and

Quæ ratiocinatio ad id cogit, ut dicamus Deum Patrem non esse sapientem, nisi habendo sapientiam quam genuit, non existendo per se pater sapientia. Deinde si ita est, filius quoque ipse sicut dicitur Deus de Deo, lumen de lumine, videndum est utrum possit sapientia de sapientia dici, si non est Deus Pater ipsa sapientia, sed tantum Genitor sapientie. Quod si tenemus, cur non & magnitudinis sue, & bonitatis, & eternitatis, & omnipotentie sue Generator sit; ut non ipse sit sua magnitudo, & sua bonitas, & sua eternitas, & sua omnipotentia, sed ea magnitudine magnus sit, quam genuit, & ea bonitate bonus, &c. St. Aug. Tom. 3. l. 6. de Trinitate.

and Light of Light, may be said to be Wisdom of Wisdom, if God the Father be not Wisdom, but only begets Wisdom; and by the same reason we may say, that he begets his own Greatness, and Goodness, and Eternity, and Omnipotency, and is not himself his own Greatness, or Goodness, or Eternity, or Omnipotency, but is Great, and Good, Eternal and Omnipotent, by the Greatness, Goodness, Eternity, Omnipotency, which is born of him; as he is not his own Wisdom, but is wise with that Wisdom, which he begets.

The Master of the Sentences follows St. *Austin* exactly in this Point, and urges this unanswerable Argument for it, which he

grounds upon St. *Austin's* Principle, That in God, to be and to be wise is the same thing; and if it be, he cannot be wise with the Wisdom he begets, for then he would receive his Being from this begotten Wisdom, not Wisdom from him: for if the

Si hoc est ibi esse quod Sapere, non per illam Sapientiam quam genuit, Sapiens dicitur Pater, alioquin non ipsa ab illo, sed ille, ab ipsa est. Si enim Sapientia; quam genuit, Causa est illi ut Sapiens sit, etiam ut sit, ipsa illi Causa est, - quod fieri non potest nisi generando eum, aut faciendo: sed nec genericem nec conditricem Patris ullo modo quisquam dixerit Sapientiam; quid enim est insanus Lib. 1. Dist. 32. cap. Præterea.

Wisdom he begets be the Cause of his being wise, it is the Cause also, that he is; which must be either by begetting or by making him; but no man will say, that Wisdom is any way the Begetter or Maker of the Father: which is the height of madness. And in the next Chapter he teaches, That the Father is unbegotten, the Son begotten Wisdom; so that according to St. *Austin* and the Master of the Sentences, who is the Oracle of the Schools, the Father is Eternal Wisdom, or an Eternal Mind, and the Son Eternal Wisdom and Mind; though both are united into One Eternal Wisdom: and if we confess this of Father and Son, there can be no Dispute about the Ho-

ly

ly Ghost, who is Eternal Mind and Wisdom, distinct, both from Father and Son.

Nothing is more familiar with the Ancient Fathers, than to represent Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, to be Three as distinct Persons, as *Peter*, *James*, and *John* are, as every one knows, who is at all versed in this Controversie; and this is charged on them by some men, as little better than Polytheism, or a Trinity of Gods, as *Peter*, *James*, and *John* are a Trinity of men; but this must be true with reference to distinction of Persons, if we will acknowledge a real distinction between them; for if the distinction be real, and not meerly nominal (which was the Heresie of *Sabellius*) their Persons must be as distinct, as three humane Persons, or three men are: The Father is no more the Son, or the Holy Ghost, than *Peter* is *James* or *John*: but then they are not seperated or divided from each other, as *Peter*, *James* and *John* are; for that indeed would make them three Gods, as *Peter*, *James* and *John* are three men.

There is no Example in Nature of such a distinction and unity, as is between the Three Persons in the Godhead, and therefore the ancient Fathers made use of several Comparisons to different purposes, which must carefully be confined to what they applied them, for if we extend them farther, we make Nonsense or Heresie of them. There are three things to be considered in the ever blessed Trinity; the Distinction of Persons, the *ὁμοουσιότης*, or Sameness of Nature, and their Essential Unity; and the Fathers make use of different Comparisons to represent each of these by, because no one can represent them all; but inconsidering Persons seek for all in One, and because they cannot find it, they reject them all, as impertinent,
dan

dangerous, or heretical, and reproach the Fathers, sometimes as ignorant of this great Mystery, sometimes as bordering upon Heresie, which I am sure does little service to the Doctrine it self, and gives great countenance to false and corrupt Notions of it; whence the Fathers themselves, even those who were the most zealous Opposers of Arianism, are thought Favourites of such Opinions. I shall have occasion to take notice of several Instances of this, as I go on, at present I shall confine my self to the Distinction of Persons, which cannot be more truly and aptly represented than by the distinction between three men; for Father, Son, and Holy Ghost are as really distinct Persons, as *Peter, James and John*; but whoever shall hence conclude, That these Fathers thought, that Father, Son, and Holy Ghost are no otherwise One also, than *Peter, James, and John* are, greatly abuse them without any colourable pretence for it, as will appear more presently; but this Comparison of theirs shows what their sense was, that these Three Divine Persons are Three Eternal and Infinite Minds, as really distinct from each other, as Three men are; though essentially united into One Infinite and Eternal Mind, or One God. But I need not insist on this, for the real distinction of Persons is so plainly taught by the ancient Fathers, especially after the rise of the *Sabellian Heresie*, that there is more difficulty to understand, how they unite them into One God, than that they make them distinct Persons, and what they say about the unity of the Godhead, abundantly proves this distinction of Persons.

Secondly, Let us therefore in the second place consider, How they explain this great Mystery of a

Trinity in Unity : they all agree , That there are Three distinct Persons, and that these Three Persons are but One God ; and they seem to me to agree very well in that account they give of it ; though some late Writers are very free, and I think very unjust, in their Censures of some of them as scarcely Orthodox in this Point : I shall only remind you , that this being so great a Mystery , of which we have no Example in Nature ; it is no wonder, if it cannot be explained by any one kind of Natural Union : and therefore it was necessary to use several Examples , and to allude to several kinds of Union , to form an adequate Notion of the Unity of the Godhead : and we must carefully apply what they say to those Ends and Purposes for which they said it ; and not extend it beyond their Intension, as I observed before : and there are several steps they take towards the Explication of this great Mystery ; which I shall represent in short, and show, that taking them altogether, they give a plain and intelligible Notion of this Unity in Trinity, and indeed no other than what I have already given of it.

I. The first thing then to be considered is the *δμοουσιότης* or Co-essentiality of the Divine Persons. That all Three Persons in the God-head have the same Nature, which they signified by the word *δμοουσιότης* : now whereas the same Nature may signifie the same Numerical , or the same Specifick Nature, *Petavius*, and after him Dr. *Cudworth*, have abundantly proved, that the *Nicene* Fathers did not understand this word of a Numerical but Specifick Sameness of Nature : or the agreement of things , numerically differing from one another in the same common Nature. As

Maximus

Petavius de
Trin. l. 4. c. 5.
Cudworth's
Intellectual
System, p. 603.
&c.

Maximus very plainly tell us, that that is said to be *δμοῦσιον*, which has the same Notion or Definition of its Essence; as a man differs nothing from a man, as he is a man, nor an Angel from an Angel, as he is an Angel: and therefore this word did equally overthrow the *Sabellian* and the *Arian* Heresie; as it affirms both a distinction of Persons, and the sameness of Nature, as *St. Ambrose* and others observe; for nothing is *δμοῦσιον* to it self, but to something else, distinct from it self, but of the same common Nature: and therefore some, who owned the *δμοῦσιον*, rejected the *μονῶσιον* and *συνῶσιον* and *πυλῶσιον* as favouring of Sabellianism, and implying such a numerical Unity of Essence in the Godhead, as destroyed all distinction of Persons; for which reason the *δμοῦσιον* it self was rejected by some, as abused by the *Sabellians*; till the signification of that word was fixt and declared by the Fathers at *Nice*, as *Petavius* observes.

This is One thing wherein the Fathers place the Unity of the Godhead; that all three Persons have the same Nature; and to be sure, this is absolutely necessary to make Three Persons One God: for it is impossible they should be One God, if they have not the same Nature, unless Three distinct and separate Beings of divers Natures can be One God; that is, unless the Divine Nature be not One pure and simple Act, but a compound Being, and that of different Natures too. But some of the Fathers went farther than this, and placed the Essential Unity of the Divine Nature in the sameness of Essence; that there is but One God, because all the Three Divine Persons have the same Nature. And it will be necessary

Ὁμοῦσιον ἔστιν, ὃ ἡ αὐτὴν ὑπόστασιν λόγον ἔχει
αὐτῶν οἷον ἀνθρώπου ἀνθρώπου καὶ ἀγγέλου ἀγγέλου
καὶ ἀγγέλου ἀγγέλου. Ἀγγέλου ἀγγέλου καὶ ἀνθρώπου ἀνθρώπου
Ἄγγελος ἔστιν ὁ ἀνθρώπου ὁ ἀνθρώπου ὁ ἀνθρώπου ὁ ἀνθρώπου
ὁ ἀνθρώπου ὁ ἀνθρώπου ὁ ἀνθρώπου ὁ ἀνθρώπου
Maximi Dial. 1. de Trinit. inter Opera
Athanasisij Vol. 2. p. 163. Edit. Paris.

Ambros. l. 3 de
Fide, c. 7.

cessary briefly to examine what they meant by it, to vindicate these Fathers from the Misrepresentations, and hard Censures of *Petavius* and *Dr. Cudworth*, who (as I hope to make appear) have greatly mistaken their Sense. The Charge is, that they make the Three Divine Persons, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, to be One God only upon account of the same Specificall Divine Nature common to them all; just as Three men are One, by having the same common Nature, or the same Humanity: and being asked, Why they may not then be called Three Gods, as well as we say, *Peter*, *James*, and *John*, are Three men; they answer, That this is owing to an ill Custom, for they ought not to be called Three men neither, which is like saying, there are Three Human Natures; and though in inferiour Matters we may bear with the abuse of Words, and improper forms of Speech, yet this is of dangerous Consequence, when we speak of God; and therefore though there is no great hurt in saying, there are Three men; though there is but one Humanity common to them all; yet we must not say there are Three Gods, since there is but One Divine Nature and Essence common to all Three Persons: This, *Petavius* says, is to deny the true and real Unity of the Divine Substance and Essence, and to make God only collectively One; as a multitude of men are said to be One People, and a multitude of Believers One Church; which was the Error of Abbot *Joachim*, for which he was Condemned in the Council of *Lateran*. *Dr. Cudworth* represents it thus: *These Theologers supposed the Three Persons of their Trinity to have really no other than a Specifick Unity and Identity, and because it seems plainly*

*Petav. de
Trin. l. 4. c. 9.*

Idi supra.

to follow from hence, that therefore they must needs be as much Three Gods, as Three men are Three men, these Learned Fathers endeavoured with their Logic to prove, that Three men are but abusively and improperly so called Three, they being really and truly but One, because there is but One and the same Specifick Essence or Substance of Human Nature in them all.—— He adds, It seems plain that this Trinity is no other than a kind of Tritheism, and that of Gods Independent and Co-ordinate too.

This is a very high Charge, and yet these Theologers are no less men than Gregory Nyssen, and Cyril of Alexandria, and Maximus, and Damascen, men of Note in their Generation, and never charged with Heresie before. But whatever the meaning of these Fathers was, it is plain, that Petavius and Dr. Cudworth have mistaken their meaning. For they did not think, that Father, Son, and Holy Ghost were one God, only as Peter, James, and John, are one man; or that Peter, James, and John are One man, as Father, Son, and Holy Ghost are One God; they neither dreamt of a Collective nor Specifick Unity of the Godhead, but asserted a real subsisting numerical Unity of Essence, as is obvious to every impartial Reader, and therefore if they had not understood, how they explained this, yet they ought not to have put such a sense upon their Words, as is directly contrary to what they affirm: I shall not need to transcribe much out of these Fathers to justify them in this Point, but will only represent their Argument as plainly as I can, and that will be their Justification, whatever become of their Argument.

They

They affirm then, That Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, are but One God, because there is, and can be, but One numerical Divinity, or one Divine Nature and Essence, though it subsist in Three distinct Persons : against this it was objected, that *Peter*,

James, and *John*, though they have the same Human Nature, yet are called Three men ; and there is no absurdity in it, when there are more than One, who have the same Nature, to speak of them in the Plural Number, to call Two Two, and Three

Καὶ εἰ ἄρτι ἀποκτὴ συνιμμένης ἡ φύσις, εἰ
πλείους εἰναι τὸ ἴδιον ὄνομα (Θ) πλὴθυντικῶς
ἀποκαθίσταται εἰς τὸν αὐτὸν διότι ἡ συνιμνία. καὶ ὁ
ἀποκαθίσταται, καὶ ὁ δὲ δὴ λέγειν τὸν δύο, καὶ πρὸς τὰς
ἑκατέρωθεν, πῶς ὁ δὲ ἡ μυστικὴν διμύκτων τὰς τρεῖς
ὁμοιοῦσι ὁμοιοῦντες, καὶ ὁμοίαν ἰσὺ αὐτοῦ ἡ
ἡ φύσις, διαφορὰν ἀποκτὴ, μαρτυροῦντα τρεῖς
πᾶσι τῇ ὁμοιότητι, μὴ μὲν ἡ δύναμις τῇ Πατρὶ
καὶ τῷ υἱῷ, καὶ τῷ ὁμοίῳ τῷ υἱῷ, καὶ τῷ
Θεῷ λέγειν ἀποκαθίσταται. Greg. Nyss. Tom. 2. p.
448. Quod non sint tres Dij.

Three ; how then comes it to pass, that Religion forbids this ; that when we acknowledge Three Persons, who have the same Nature without any imaginable difference, we must in a manner contradict our selves, confessing the Divinity of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost to be One and the same, and denying that they are Three Gods.

This *Gregory Nyssen* answers at large, and I shall chiefly confine my self to the Answers he gives, which will abundantly shew, how much these two Learned Men have mis-represented his Sense.

And first, he takes notice of the common Form of Speech, of calling Three, who partake of the same Human Nature, Three Men ; which inclines us to call the Three Divine Persons, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, who have all the same Divine Nature Three Gods ; and that naturally betrays men into the Opinion of a Trinity of Gods, as well as of a Trinity of Persons, who are as much Three Gods, as *Peter*, *James*, and *John*, are Three men : and therefore he tells us, that this is an improper way of speaking, even

even when applied to men , to say, that there are Three men. For man is the name of Nature, not of the Person : to say that there is but One man , is no more than to say, there is but One Humanity ; and to say there are Three men, is to say, there are Three Humanities, or Three Human Natures ; and the Name of Nature cannot be a proper Name of distinction , and therefore ought not to be multiplied : for that which is the same in all , cannot distinguish one Person from another. This he observes all men are very sensible of ; for when they would call any particular Person out of a Crowd ; they do not call him by the Name of Nature ; that is, they do not say, you *man* come hither ; for this being a common Name, as the Nature is common , no man could tell, who was meant : but they call him by the Name of his Person, *Peter*, or *James* ; for though there are many , who partake of the same Human Nature, yet there is but One man, or One Humanity in them all : Persons are distinguished and divided and multiplied by peculiar personal properties , and therefore may be numbred ; but Nature is One, united with it self, a perfect indivisible Unity, which neither increases by addition , nor is diminished by Substraction, but though it be in a Multitude of Individuals, is whole , entire , and undivided, in all. And therefore as a People, an Army, a Church, are named in the single number, though they consist of Multitudes : so in exactness and propriety of Speech, man may be said to be One, though there are a Multitude who partake of the same Human Nature. So that, hitherto all that the Father hath said , tends only to justify this Form of Speech, as having nothing absurd or incongruous in it ; to acknowledge, that

that the Father is God, the Son God, and the Holy Ghost God, and yet that there is but One Divinity or Godhead, not Three Gods, for though this sounds as harsh, as to own, that *Peter* is a man, and *James* a man, and *John* a man, and yet there are not Three men, but One man, which Custom has made very absurd and contradictory to say, (which is the Objection he was to Answer) yet he observes, that according to strict propriety of speaking, this is no absurdity to say, there are not Three men, but One man, nay, that it is an abuse of Speech to say otherwise, because *man* is the Name of Nature, not of a Person, and therefore there is but One man, as there is but One Human Nature in all those, who partake of it, for Human Nature is but One, whole, and indivisible in all; and therefore cannot distinguish One Person from another, and therefore not be a Name of Number.

But what makes St. *Gregory* dispute thus nicely about the use of words, and oppose the common and ordinary Forms of Speech? Did he in good earnest believe, that there is but One man in the World? No! No! he acknowledged as many men, as we do; a great Multitude who had the same Human Nature, and that every One who had a Human Nature, was an individual man; distinguished and divided from all other Individuals of the same Nature: what makes him so zealous then against saying, that *Peter*, *James*, and *John*, are Three men? Only this; that he says *Man* is the Name of Nature, and therefore to say there are Three men, is the same as to say, there are Three Human Natures of a different kind; for if there are Three Human Natures, they must differ from each other, or they can't be Three; and so you deny

any one should be betrayed into that Conceit, that we mean a Multitude of Humanities, or many different Human Natures; but there is danger, lest our naming more Gods, or saying, that there are Three Gods, men should imagine, that there are divers and different Natures in the Divinity, that is, that the Three Persons in the Godhead are not all of the same Nature.

Here St. Gregory lays his Foundation, That we must not say, there are Three Gods, because there is but One Divinity; Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, being all *ὁμοούσιος*, of the same Nature, whereas God being the Name of Nature, to say there are Three Gods, is to say, there are Three different Divinities, or Divine Natures, which destroys the Homoeousiotes of the Godhead; which is the Sum of his Argument against using the Name of Nature Plurally, to say, there are Three men, or Three Gods.

Arbanasij Vol.
1. Dial. 1. de
Trin.

There is nothing more plain than this in the Dialogues of *Maximus*, who all along explains this *μία θεὸς* and *μία ἀθεωότης* the One Divinity, and the One Humanity, by the *τὸ ὁμοούσιον*, or the Sameness of Nature, and therefore there can be but One Nature, though it subsist in several Persons, or Individuals.

Now indeed had they gone no farther in explaining the Unity of the Godhead, than this Specifick Unity and Identity of Nature; there had been some reason to quarrel with them; but they do not stop here, but proceed to show, how this *ὁμοούσιον* or Sameness of Nature in all Three Persons of the ever blessed Trinity, proves a true Numerical and Essential Unity of the Godhead; which it does not, and cannot do in created Natures: without this it is evident,

dent, there can be no Essential Unity, unless we will allow of a Composition of different Natures in the Godhead; where the Nature is the same it may be One, not only by a Logical, but by a Real and Essential Unity.

Gregory Nyssen has two ways of doing this. 1. He observes, that the Name *God*, and so those other Names which are ascribed to the Divinity, do not so properly signify the Divine Nature, as declare something relating to it: for the Divine Nature is ἀνορέσιμον ἢ ἀπειρον, that which has no Name, and which no words can express and signify, as the Scripture teaches: but the Names given to God only teach us, either what we ought not to attribute to the Divine Nature, or what we ought, but not what the Divine Nature it self is.

This is a fair Introduction, such as becomes a wife man, who considers, how unknown the Effences of all Things are to us, much more the Substance and Effence of God; and how it confounds our Minds, when we talk of the Numerical Unity of the Godhead, to have the least conception or thought about the distinction and union of Natures and Effences; and therefore he tells us, that *Qods* is *Seiark*, and *Ipse*, the Inspector and Governour of the World; that is, it is a Name of Energie, Operation, and Power; and if this Vertue, Energie, Operation be the very same in all

Ὁ ἐκείνους διέχοντες μὴ αὐτοὺς ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν
ὕπο πρὸς ἑξὶ δομῶνται συνημιώμεται, ἀλλὰ τὸ ἑξὶ
πρὸς αὐτοὺς ὅτι ἑξὶ λαμβάνειν γινώσκουσιν. Καὶ
τὸ ἐκείνους αὐτοὺς ὅτι αὐτοὶ λέγοντες τὸ ἐκείνους
ταῖς διανοήμασι καὶ αὐτοὶ συνημιώμεται ὑπερκαμῶν,
τὸ μὴ εἶναι ὅτι ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν γινώσκουσιν ἀπαρανόητον
καὶ τὸ ἑξὶ διέχοντες αὐτοὺς ὅτι ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν
ἐκείνους ὅτι πρὸς αὐτοὺς. Greg. Nyss. Vol. 2. p.
451.

the Persons of the Trinity, Father, Son, and Holy

Ghost, then they are but One God, but One Power and Energie; and thus he proves it is, and that not as it is among men, who have the same Power and Skill, do the very same Things, profess the same Art,

ὅτι ἄνθρωποι μὲν, καὶ οὐ μὴν θεοὶ ἐνεργεῖς
οἱ ὁμοίως, καὶ ὁ αὐτὸς θεὸς δύναμις καὶ ἐνέργεια. ὅτι
ἐνέργειά τοι ἀπολαμβάνουσι, ὅθεν ἐκκεντὰς ἐκ τοῦ καὶ
αὐτοῦ ἐνεργεῖα ὁμοῦ τῆς τοῦ ἱεροῦ ἐκκεντῶντος
ἰδίας ἐνεργείας ὁ θεὸς, καὶ ἰδίας ὁ υἱός.
ἰσὺν ἐν μὲν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, ἐν αὐτῇ δυνά-
μει καὶ ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ ἐκκεντῶντος ἐνεργείᾳ
ἀδελφεῖ, κυρίως πολλοὶ ἀπολαμβάνουσι
Ibid. p. 453.

are Philosophers or Orators alike; and yet are not all One Philosopher, or One Orator; because though they do the same thing, yet they act apart, every one by himself, and have no Communion nor share in what each other do; but their Operations are proper to themselves alone; but in the Divine Nature it is not so; the Father does nothing by himself, nor the Son by himself, nor the Holy Ghost by himself; but the whole Energie and Operation of the Deity relating to Creatures, begins with the Father, passes to the Son, and from Father and Son to the Holy Spirit: The Holy Trinity does not act any thing separately; there are not Three distinct Operations, as there are Three Persons, ἀλλὰ μία τῆς θέου ἀγα-
θῆ βουλῆ καὶ κινήσεως καὶ διακρίσεως, but one motion and disposition of the good Will, which passes through the whole Trinity from Father to Son, and to the Holy Ghost, and this is done ἀχρόνως καὶ ἀδιαστάτως, without any distance of Time, or propagating the Motion from one to t'other, but by One thought, as it is in One numerical Mind and Spirit, and therefore though they are Three Persons, they are but one numerical Power and Energie.

By this time I hope the Reader is satisfied, That this Father does not make the Persons of the Trinity
Three

Ibid. p. 456,
457.

Three Independent and Coordinate Gods, who are no otherwise One than Three men are by a Specifick Unity and Identity of Nature; but has found out such an Unity for them, as he confesses cannot be between Three men; even such an Unity as there is in a Spirit, which is numerically One with it self, and conscious to all its own Motions; for I leave any man to judge, whether this *μία νόμος βαλμω-
τα*, this one single Motion of Will which is in the same instant in Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, can signifie any thing else but a mutual consciousness, which makes them numerically One, and as intimate to each other, as every man is to himself, as I have already explained it. *Petavius* was aware of this, and therefore will not allow this to belong to the same Argument, but to be a new and distinct Argument by it self: Now suppose this, yet methinks he should have suspected, he had mistaken the Fathers Sense, when he found him contradict, what he apprehended to be his Sense, within the compass of two Pages; but indeed the mistake is his own; for the Father pursues his intended Argument, to prove, that though the Father is God, and the Son God, and the Holy Ghost God, yet we ought not to say, that there are Three Gods, but One God. This he proves, first, because God is the Name of Nature, and the Name of Nature must not be expressed in the Plural number, when the Nature is the same without any the least conceivable difference; for to say, there are Three Gods, is to say, that there are Three different Divine Natures, which introduces *Polytheism*; as to say there are Three men, is to say, there are Three different Human Natures; for if they be the same; they are not Three; and therefore the Name of the Na-

Nature must not be expressed plurally, how many Persons soever there are, who have the same Nature. This was to secure the Homouousiotes of the Divine Nature, and if he had stopped here, *Petavius* and *Dr. Cudworth* might have said, what they pleased of him; but having secured the Homouousiotes or Sameness of Nature, which was the great Dispute of those days between the Orthodox and the Arians, he proceeds to show, how this same Nature in Three distinct Persons is united into one numerical Essence and Godhead; and this he does first by showing, that God signifies Power and Energie, and that all the Three Persons in the Trinity have but One numerical Energie and Operation, and therefore are but One God; which is only the improvement of his former Argument; for the Sameness of Nature is necessary to the Sameness of Operation; for Nature is the Principle of Action, especially in God, whose Nature is a pure and simple Act, and an unity and singularity of Energie and Operation is a demonstration of One numerical Essence; for the same single individual Act cannot be done by Two separate Beings, who must act separately also.

Secondly, As for those, who are not contented to contemplate God as a pure and simple Act or Energie, which easily solves this difficulty, how Three Persons are One God, they having but One numerical Energie and Operation; I say, as for those who not contented with this, inquire after the Unity of the Divine Nature and Essence, he asserts that this perfect Homouousiotes or Sameness of Nature, without the least difference or alteration makes them numerically One; and returns to what he had first said,

But however he might be mistaken in his Philosophy, he was not in his Divinity: for he asserts a numerical Unity of the Divine Nature; not a meer Specifick Unity, which is nothing but a Logical Notion; nor a Collective Unity, which is nothing but a Company, who are naturally many; but a true subsisting numerical Unity of Nature: and in the difficulty of explaining this, and his zeal to defend it, forced him upon some unintelligible Niceties, to prove that the same numerical Human Nature too is but one in all men, it is hard to charge him with teaching, that there are Three Independant and Coordinate Gods, because we think he has not proved, that *Peter, James, and John*, are but One man. This will make very foul work with the Fathers, if we charge them with all those Erronious Conceits about the Trinity, which we can fancy in their inconvenient ways of explaining that venerable Mystery, especially when they compare that mysterious Unity with any Natural Unions.

I am sure *St. Gregory* was so far from suspecting that he should be charged with Tritheism upon this Account, that he fences against another Charge of mixing and confounding the Hypostases or Persons, by denying any difference or diversity of Nature. *ὡς ἐν τῷ μὴ διχιστάει τὴ κατὰ φύσιν διαφοράν, μὴ ἐν τῷ τῷ ἑωσάμεν καὶ ἀνακρίνομεν κατὰ φύσιν ὁμοῦ*, which argues, that he thought he had so fully asserted the Unity of the Divine Essence, that some might suspect, he had left but One Person, as well as One Nature, in God.

But though the Homousiotes or Coessentiality of the Divine Persons is not sufficient alone to prove this Unity of the Godhead, yet as I before observed, this

Holy and Ever Blessed TRINITY.

121

this is necessary to an essential Unity, for they must all have the same Nature, or they cannot be One, and therefore this was the first thing to be considered in the Unity of the Godhead.

Secondly, To this *Homo-ousiotes* the Fathers added a numerical Unity of the Divine Essence. This *Petavius* Vol. 2. *Petavius* has proved at large by numerous Testimonies, ^{1. 4 c. 13, 14.} even from those very Fathers, whom he before accused for making God only collectively One, as Three Men are One Man; such as *Gregory Nyssen*, *St. Cyril*, *Maximus*, *Damascen*; which is a demonstration, that however he might mistake their explication of it, from the Unity of human Nature, they were far enough from *Tritheism*, or One collective God.

For we must observe, though all the Fathers assert, the singularity of the Godhead, or the numerical Unity of the Divine Essence, yet they do not assert such a numerical Unity, as there is, where there is but One Person as well as One Essence; but such a numerical Unity, as there is between Three, who are *δυσόμοι*, of the very same nature, but are not merely united by a specifick Unity, but by an essential Union, and therefore are Three and One. This as *Maximus* truly says, is *παραδοξὸν καὶ ἡ διζήσις καὶ ἡ ἔνωσις*, both a wonderful distinction and union, but though several Fathers attempt several ways of explaining it, they all agree in the thing; that Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, Three distinct Divine Persons, are united in one numerical Nature and Essence.

And I cannot but observe, that *Petavius* greatly commends *Boethius's* explication of this Mystery, which is the very same he had before condemned in

R

• *Gregory*

Ibid. p. 430.

Gregory Nyssen, and those other Fathers. That Father, Son, and Holy Ghost are One God, not Three Gods: *Cujus conjunctionis ratio est indifferentia*: the reason or manner of which Union and Conjunction is their indifference; that is, such a sameness of Nature, as admits of no difference or variety, or an exact *Homo-ousiotes*, as he explains it: *Eos enim differentia comitatur, qui vel augent vel minuant, ut Arianus qui gradibus meritorum Trinitatem variantes distrahant, atq; in pluralitatem deducunt*: Those make a difference, who augment and diminish, as the *Arians* do, who distinguish the Trinity into different Natures, as well as Persons, of different worth and excellency, and thus divide and multiply the Trinity into a plurality of Gods. *Principium enim pluralitatis alteritas est: Præter alteritatem enim nec pluralitas quid sit intelligi potest*: For the beginning of plurality is alterity; for we know not what plurality is but alterity: that is, there must be some difference in the Nature of Things to make them Two or Three, but when the Nature is exactly the same, they are but One: which is exactly the same account, which Gregory gave of it, as I have already shewn; and why this should be little better than Heresie in him, and very good Divinity in Boetius, is a little mysterious; for after all, this numerical Unity of Essence is nothing else, but an *ἀναπαύμενος ὁμοούσιος*, where there are no *divinites*, as *Maximus* speaks, such an invariable sameness of Nature, as has no differences to distinguish it, and therefore must be One: For these Fathers apprehended, that where there was such an exact sameness of Nature, they did mutually exist in each other, and were but One Power and Energy, Will and Counsel, and therefore but One God-head

vine Essence numerically One; and indeed these Two are but One, and both of them nothing more than what I have explained, I think, a little more intelligibly by a mutual consciousness, whereby all Three Divine Persons are mutually in each other, and have but One Energy and Operation.

That the Fathers universally acknowledged, That the Operation of the whole Trinity, *ad extra*, is but One, *Petavius* has proved beyond all contradiction; and hence they conclude the Unity of the Divine Nature and Essence; for every Nature has a vertue and energy of its own; for Nature is a principle of Action, and if the Energy and Operation be but One, there can be but One Nature; and if there be Two distinct and divided Operations, if either of them can act alone without the other, there must be two divided Natures.

This is certainly true, but yet it gives no account, how Three distinct Persons come to have but One Will, One Energy, Power, and Operation; and there is no account to be given of it, that I know of, but what I have now given, *viz.* mutual consciousness; and that is a very plain account of it: for if all Three Persons be conscious to each other, as every Man is to himself, there can be but *ἐν ἑαυτοῖς αὐτῶν ὁ θεός* *καὶ κίνημα τε καὶ βέλημα*, as *Gregory Nazianzen* speaks, but One and the same motion and Will of the Deity; they must move and act all together, according to the order and subordination of the Divine Persons; and it is impossible they should do so without this mutual consciousness, as it is, that Three Men, who are not conscious to each other, should have but one single motion of Will, in One single and undivided Act: The Fathers then and I agree in this

this, that the Unity of the Divine Nature and Essence consists in the singularity of Operation; I only add, how this Energy and Operation is, and must be one, by a mutual consciousness; and if this be a reasonable and intelligible account, I hope it is no fault.

And there is no other account to be given of that mutual In-being of the Divine Persons in each other, which they call the *περίχωρον*, as Christ tells us, *I am in the Father, and the Father in me*: the necessity of this they saw, from what our Saviour says, and because it is impossible they should be One without such an inseparable and intimate Union and Presence and Inhabitation in each other: and therefore *Damasce* tells us, that they cannot go out of each other, nor be separated; but are united and mutually penetrate each other without confusion, *Ανεχώρητοι δὲ αὐτοὶ ἢ ἀδιαχώρητοι ἀλλήλων, ἢ χωριστοὶ ἢ ἐκ ἀλλήλων ἀνυσχέτως παραμένοντες ἐνσκημνόμενοι.* Dam. l. 3. c. 5.

Such an Union as this they all agreed in, as *Peta-De Trin. l. 4.* *uius* largely shews, but how to explain it they know not; sometimes they are thus intimately united by the sameness of Nature, but this might be the cause of this Union, but does not explain what this intimate Union is; sometimes they represent it by corporeal similitudes, which raise gross and material Images in the mind, unworthy of the pure and simple Essence of God: as the mixture and union of the Light of several Candles in the same Room, and of the Colours of the Rainbow, &c. which is owing to a material conception of the Divine Substance, and the Union of Substances, which we know nothing of; but had they contemplated God as a pure Mind, it had been easie to explain this *Perichoresis*, or In-dwelling of the Divine Persons in each other: for there is, and can be no other Union of Minds but consciousness, and by a mutual consciousness they are as intimate to each other,

other, as they are to themselves; and are whatever each other is; as I have explained it at large; and I hope, this is no fault neither, to give an intelligible Explication of that, which all the Fathers taught, but were not always equally happy in their Explications of it.

But to do St. *Austin* right, though he do not name this consciousness, yet he explains this Trinity in Unity by examples of mutual consciousness: I named one of his Similitudes before, of the Unity of our Understanding, Memory, and Will, which are all conscious to each other; that we remember what we understand and will; we understand what we remember and will; and what we will, we remember and understand; and therefore all these Three Faculties do penetrate and comprehend each other. But his Ninth Book, *De Trinitate*, is spent wholly upon this Argument. It is very familiar with the Ancient Fathers to represent the Father as the infinite Original Mind; the Son the Wisdom of the Father, his Image, or reflex knowledge of himself; and the Holy Spirit that Divine Love, wherewith Father and Son love each other; St. *Austin* takes this similitude of a Mind, its knowledge of itself, and love of itself, and shews how these are Three and One, which he makes a faint Image of, and resemblance of a Trinity in Unity. Now the Mind, when it knows its whole self, its knowledge comprehends its whole self; and when it perfectly loves itself, it loves its whole self, and its love comprehends its whole self; and this proves them to be

Tgitur ipsa mens, amor, & notitia ipsa, tria quædam sunt, & hæc tria unum sunt, & cum perfecta sunt equalia sunt.

Mens autem cum se totam novit, hoc est, perfectè novit, per totum quæ est notitia ipsa; & cum se perfecte amat, totum se amat, & per totum est amor ipsa. Quomodo autem ista tria non sint ejusdem substantiæ non video, cum mens ipsa se amet, & ipsa se novit. Atque ita sunt hæc tria, ut non alteri alicui rerum mens vel amata vel nota sit. Unius ergo ejusdemque essentie necesse est hæc tria sint.

be of the same Substance; for the Mind knows itself, and loves itself, and these are so Three, that the Mind is known and loved by nothing else, and therefore it is necessary that these Three have One Nature and Essence.

He proceeds to shew, that this Unity is without all manner of confusion and mixture, as it is in the Sacred Trinity, where the Persons are united, but distinct; for mixture of Persons destroys the Trinity: and shows, how each of them are distinct, and then how they are alternately in each other; for the Mind that loves is in the love, and love in the knowledge of the Lover, and knowledge in the knowing Mind; and how each of them is in the other two; for the Mind, which knows and loves itself, is in its own knowledge and love; and the love of the Mind, which knows and loves itself, is in its own knowledge, and the knowledge of the Mind which knows and loves itself, is in the Mind, and in its love, because it loves itself knowing, and knows itself loving; and thus also two are in each, for the Mind which knows and loves itself, with its knowledge is in love, and with its love is in knowledge; for love and knowledge are together in the Mind, which loves and knows itself: and the whole is in the whole; for the whole Mind loves itself, and knows its whole self, and knows its whole love, and loves its whole knowledge. I need not tell any Man, that this is the mutual confes-

ousness

In alteris autem ita sunt quia mens amans in amore est, & amor in amantis noticia, & noticia in mente noscente. Singula in binis ita sunt, quia mens que se novit & amat, in amore & noticia sua est: & amor amantis mentis, scilicet scientis in mente, notitiam suam est: & noticia scientis & amantis in mente atque amore ipsa est, quia scientem se amat, & amantem se novit. At per hoc & bina in singulari, quia mens que se novit & amat, cum sua noticia est in amore, & cum suo amore in noticia; amor quippe ipse & noticia simul sunt in mente que se amat & novit. Tota vero in totis quemadmodum sunt jam supra ostendimus, cum si tota mens amat, & totam novit, & totum amorem suum novit, totamque amat notitiam suam.

ousness which I have described, and by this St. *Austin* represents the Trinity in-Unity; and I hope his Authority will defend me from the charge of Innovation; and I am sure the reason of the thing will defend itself.

But for the better understanding of this, we must further observe, that the Fathers resolve the Unity of the Godhead into the Unity of Principle: that is, though there be Three Divine Persons in the Godhead, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, yet the Father is the Original Fountain of the Deity, who begets the Son of his own Substance, and from whom, and the Son, the Holy Ghost eternally proceeds, of the same Substance with Father and Son: So that there is but one Principle and Fountain of the Deity, and therefore but One God.

But this, as *Potavius* well observes, does not of itself prove the Unity of the Godhead, but only the

δμοιότης, or sameness of Nature; and therefore the Fathers add, That God begets a Son not without, but within himself, for the Wisdom of God is within him, and inseparable from him:

This they illustrated by the Sun,

its light and splendour, which are coæval and inseparable; by the Fountain, and its Streams; by a Tree, and its Branches, which are united in One; which Comparisons must not be strained farther than they were intended, as if Father, Son, and Holy Ghost were one in the same manner, as the Sun and its Light, or the Tree and its Branches, or the Fountain, River, and Streams, but only that there is such a natural
and

Τὸ αὐτὸ ἴδιον ἐστὶν τὸ πᾶν ἡμεῖς τὸ πᾶν ἡμεῖς
ἰς τὴν ἑκκλ. ἐκκλ., ἀλλ' ἐν τῇ ἑκκλ. πατρὶς
ἐκκλ. Athan. Syn. Nic. Decret. p. 261.

Καὶ ὁ πατήρ ἵδων ἑαυτὸν ἵδεν τὸν υἱόν
αὐτοῦ τὸ ἐξ αὐτοῦ ὅτι αὐτοῦ πάλιν ὁμοῦ.
p. 265.

Καὶ ἐν αὐτῇ αὐτῇ ἀναρτῶν — ὑπαρξάν
αὐτοῦ πᾶσι τῇ πατρὶς αἰσιν, αὐτὸς μετ' αὐτοῦ.
p. 268.

Holy and Ever Blessed TRINITY.

129

and essential Union between the Divine Persons, as makes them One numerical God.

But there is something still to be added to this to compleat this Notion, that as the Father is the Fountain of the Deity, and the Son and Holy Ghost inseparably united to him, so Father, Son, and Holy Ghost are essential to One God, as St. *Austin* calls the Trinity, *Unam quandam summam rem*, One Supreme Thing: And as all acknowledge, that the Three Persons are One God, and since God is the most necessary Being, all Three Persons are necessary and essential to One God: That there must necessarily be Three Divine Persons in the Unity of the Godhead, and there can be no more.

Aug. l. i. De Doct. Christ. c. 5.

For the explication of this, I shall proceed by these steps, which are all plain, and universally acknowledged.

1. That there are no Accidents, nor Qualities, nor Faculties in God, as there are in created Spirits; but whatever is in God is *οσιωδες*, Essence and Substance, a pure and simple Act. This is universally acknowledged by all Christians: St. *Austin* affirms, That

Aug. de Trin. l. 5. c. 3.

there are no Accidents in God: *Athanasius*, That there is no Composition in God, as between Substance and Accident, (and it is much alike, as to Mind and its different Faculties and Powers, which is a Composition) but that God is *απλὸν τι*, a pure simple Act: but there is no need of Testimonies to prove that, which Natural Reason proves; for nothing can be External and Self-originated, but a pure and simple Act, for what is compounded is made; for it wants a Maker.

Athas. Syn. Nicenz Decr. p. 271.

S

2. That

2. That it is essential to an eternal Mind to know itself, and to love itself; for this is essential to a Mind; no human Mind can be without it, much less the most perfect and excellent Mind; and therefore God does know himself, and love himself and his own Image.

3. That Original Mind and Wisdom, and the Knowledge of it self, and love of it self, and its own Image, are distinct Acts, and never can be One simple, individual Act. They are distinct Powers and Faculties in men, Knowledge, Self-reflexion, and Love, and are so distinct, that they can never be the same: Knowledge is not Self-reflection, nor love either Knowledge or Self-reflection, though they are inseparably united, they are distinct.

4. Therefore these three Acts, which are so distinct, that they can never be the same, must be three substantial Acts in God, that is, three Divine subsisting Persons; for there is nothing but Essence and Substance in God; no Accident, or Faculties, as there are in Creatures.

5. That these are the true and proper Characters of the distinct Persons in the ever blessed Trinity. The Father is Original Mind and Wisdom; the Son the Word and Wisdom of the Father; that is, the reflex knowledge of himself, which is the perfect Image of his own Wisdom; the Holy Ghost, that Divine Love which Father and Son have for each other: It would be very impertinent to confirm this by the Authority of the ancient Fathers, because all men, who know any thing of them, know that this is their constant language.

I am sure this is very agreeable to the Language of Scripture, and Answers all those Characters we find there of the Son and Holy Ghost.

The

Holy and Ever Blessed TRINITY.

131

The Son is expressly called the Word and the Wisdom of God. That Word *which was in the beginning, which was with God, and was God*, 1 John 1. For God did certainly always know himself, and therefore this Word was always with God, intimately present with him, not as our transient and vanishing Reflections are, but as a permanent and substantial Word, the subsisting and living Image of his Fathers Wisdom: as he is called *the Brightness of his Fathers Glory, and the express Image of his Person*, 1 Heb. 2. His Fathers Glory and Person is Eternal and Original Wisdom; He is his Fathers begotten Wisdom, or the bright Reflexion of his Wisdom; which is as perfect and exact, as the Fathers Knowledge of himself. And therefore St. John might well say, *No man hath seen God at any time, the only begotten Son, who is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him*, 1 John 18. And our Saviour might well tell us, *As the Father knoweth me, even so know I the Father*, 10 John 15. that he seeth all that the Father doth: That he receiveth all his Commands from the Father, that he that seeth him, seeth the Father; and many such like Expressions he uses to signify his perfect knowledge of his Father; for he is that Wisdom and Knowledge wherewith his Father knows himself; and if the Father perfectly knows himself, he is the perfect Image and Wisdom of the Father.

For this reason he is called the *Son*, because he is the perfect Image of the Father, begotten of his own Eternal Wisdom, by a reflex Act upon himself: for he begets his own Son in his own likeness by knowing himself; and therefore the Son must be of the same Nature, the very Wisdom of the Father, unless the Father knows himself otherwise than he really is.

This is the Eternal Son and Word of God, whereby he made the Worlds ; for it is this reflex Knowledge and Wisdom, which makes all things : The Eternal Ideas of Truth and Wisdom in the Divine Mind effect nothing no more than meer Speculation does in us , till it is brought into Act by reflexion ; for it was this reflex Knowledge, which took the Patterns of things for the new World , and gave Being to them ; and therefore God made the World by his Son and begotten Wisdom ; who doth all things by seeing what the Father doth , as the Father doth all things by seeing himself in his reflex and begotten Wisdom ; for the Father and the Son are one single Energie and Operation.

This is that eternal Word and Reason, that true light, which lighteth every man that cometh into the world, which communicates the light of Reason, and the eternal Idea's of Truth to Mankind : This is that Son, who reveals the Father to us, and acquaints us with his secret Counsels for the Salvation of Sinners.

v. 18.
v. 14. This is that Word which became Flesh , and dwelt among us, who hath undertaken the Work of our Redemption, and is become the Wisdom of God , and the Power of God to Salvation to them that believe : for all the natural Communications of Wisdom and Reason ; all the new Discoveries of the Divine Wisdom ; whatever the Divine Wisdom immediately does, must be done by this begotten Wisdom ; that is, by a reflex Wisdom, which is the Principle of Action and Execution : and therefore as God made the World by his Word, so also he redeems the World by his Incarnate Word ; this being as immediate an effect of the Divine Wisdom and Counsel , as his Creation of the World :

As

Holy and Ever Blessed TRINITY.

133

As for the Holy Ghost, whose Nature is represented to be Love, I do not indeed find in Scripture, that it is any where said, that the Holy Ghost is that mutual love, wherewith Father and Son love each other: but this we know, that there is a mutual love between Father and Son: *The Father loveth the Son,* ^{3 John 35.} *and hath given all things into his hands. And the Father loveth the Son, and sheweth him all things, that himself doth.* And our Saviour himself tells us, *I love the Father.* And I shewed before, that love is a ^{14 John 31.} distinct Act, and therefore in God must be a Person; for there are no Accidents nor Faculties in God. And that the Holy Spirit is a Divine Person is sufficiently evident in Scripture: for he is the Spirit of God, who ^{1 Cor. 2.11.} knows what is in God, as the Spirit of Man knows ^{1 John 4. 16.} what is in Man, and he is the Spirit of Christ, who receiveth of the things of Christ; and his peculiar Character in Scripture is love; which shews us, what he is in his own Nature, as well as what he is in his Effects and Operations, for Nature and Energy is the same in God.

It is by the Holy Spirit, that the Love of God is shed abroad in our hearts, ^{5 Rom. 5.} *The Love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost which is given unto us.* For this Spirit is the essential love of God, and therefore both inspires us with the love of God, and gives us a feeling sense of God's love to us.

He is the Spirit of the Son, the Spirit of Adoption, ^{8 Rom. 15.} *whereby we cry Abba Father, and which cries in our hearts Abba Father. The Spirit of the Son; that is,* ^{4 Gal. 6.} *of the eternal and only begotten Son; that very Spirit, whereby the eternal Son calls God Father, whereby the Father owns the Son, and the Son the Father;*
that

that is, that essential Love, which is between Father and Son; and therefore wherever this Spirit of the Son is, it will call God Father, will cry *Abba Father*; that is, is a Spirit of Adoption in us; for the eternal Spirit of the Son, dwells only in Sons; by our Union to Christ, who is the eternal Son of God, we become his adopted Sons, and as such the Spirit of the Son dwells in us.

5 Gal. 22.

And therefore the fruits and operations of the Spirit answer this Character. *For the fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, meekness*, which are the communications of the Spirit of Love.

This shews the difference between generation and procession, between being a Son, and the Spirit of God. Generation, as I observed before, is a reflex Act, whereby God begets his own Image and Likeness; it is God's knowledge of himself, which to be sure is his own perfect Image; and the living essential Image of God is his Son: for to be a Son, is to be begotten of his Father's Substance, in his own Likeness and Image. But the Divine Spirit, or this Eternal Love proceeds from God, is not a reflex but a direct Act, as all Thoughts and Passions are said to proceed out of the Heart: a reflex Act turns upon it self, and begets its own likeness; but Love is a direct Act, and comes out of the Heart; and thus does this eternal Love proceed from God: besides, this eternal Love is not the Image of God, but his eternal complacency in himself and his own Image, and therefore is not a Son begotten of him, but the eternal Spirit which proceeds from him. It is true, this eternal subsisting Love, which is the third Person of the Trinity, has all the Perfections of Father and Son in himself; for Love must

must have the perfect Idea of what it loves, and therefore this subsisting Love must have all those Perfections in himself, which are the Eternal Object and Cause of this Eternal Love; but his essential Character is Love, and though Love has the whole Divine Perfections in it self, yet it has them not as a Son, not as the Image of God.

This gives a plain Account also, how he is the Spirit of the Father, and the Spirit of the Son, and according to the Profession of the Latin Church, proceeds both from Father and Son; for this Divine Love eternally proceeds from God's reflex Knowledge of himself, or seeing himself in his own Image: he loves himself in his Image, and therefore the Spirit proceeds from Father and Son; that is, from the Original and the Image, by one undivided Act: as every man loves himself in that Idea and Image he has formed of himself in his own Mind.

And no man will wonder, that the Creation of the World is ascribed to the Holy Spirit, as well as to the Father and Son; for it is Eternal Love which gives Being to all things, which is the Author and Giver of Life, without which Infinite Wisdom and Power produces no One Effect: Original Wisdom contains the Ideas of all Things, and begotten Wisdom can frame the Natures of Things according to the Original Ideas of the Divine Mind, but it is Love which gives Being to them.

6. From hence it is clear, That these Three Divine Persons, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, are one God, as these Three Powers, of Understanding, Self-reflexion, and Self-love are one Mind: for what are meer Faculties and Powers in created Spirits, are Persons in the Godhead, really distinct from each other,

ther, but as inseparably United into One, as Three different Powers are essentially united in One Mind : There is a vast difference indeed between them, as there is between God and Creatures; the Mind is but One, the Faculties and Powers more, but these being only Faculties and Powers, neither of them is a whole entire Mind: the Understanding alone is not the whole entire Mind, nor Reflexion, nor Love, but the Mind is whole and entire by the union of them all in One: but these being Persons in the Godhead, each Person has the whole Divine Nature: The Son has all that the Father has, being his perfect and natural Image; and the Holy Spirit, is all that Father and Son is, comprehending all their infinite Perfections in Eternal Love: and they are all the same, and all united into One God, as the several Faculties and Powers are in One Mind.

7. For this proves, that these Divine Persons are intimately conscious to each other, which, as I before showed, makes them One numerical God: for as the same Mind is conscious to all its own Faculties and Powers, and by that unites them into One; so where there are Divine and Infinite Persons instead of Faculties and Powers, they must be mutually conscious to each other, to make them all One God.

8. This proves also, that though there are Three distinct Persons, there can be but One Energie and Operation; Father, Son, and Holy Ghost is the Maker and Governour of the World by one inseparable and undivided Energie: neither of them do nor can act apart: as the several Powers of the Mind all concur to the same individual Action; Knowledge, Self-reflection, and Will, do the same thing, which is the Effect of Knowledge brought into act by Reflection
and

and Will: and yet the Effect may be ascribed to Knowledge, and ascribed to Will, as the making of the World is to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost, not separately to either, but as they act in Conjunction, and produce the same Effect by One individual Energie and Power.

9. This proves also, that Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, must be co-eternal, as the several Powers and Faculties must be co-temporary, and co-exist in the same Mind. Understanding cannot be without a Power of Reflection, nor that without Will and Love. And I suppose, no man will say, that there could be any imaginable instant, wherein God did not know and love himself.

This Account is very agreeable to what St. *Austin* St. Aug. Tom. 3 de Trin. l. 9. has given us; who represents the Father to be Original Mind, the Son his Knowledge of himself, and the Holy Spirit Divine Love, as I have done; and gives the very same Account of their Union. *Cum itaque se mens novit & amat, jungitur ei amore verbum ejus, & quoniam amat notitiam, & novit amorem, & verbum in amore est, & amor in verbo, & utrumque in amante & dicente.* When the Mind knows and loves it self, its Word is united to it by Love, and because it loves its Knowledge, and knows its Love; its Word is in Love, and Love in its Word, and both in the loving, and speaking or knowing Mind. This is the Eternal Generation of the Son: *Itaque mens cum seipsam cognoscit, sola parens est notitiæ suæ, & cognitum enim & cognitor ipsa est;* when the Mind knows it self, it is the sole Parent of its own Knowledge; for its self is both the Knower and the Thing known; that is, the Son is begotten of the Father by a reflex Knowledge of himself;

T and

and he gives us the same Account of the Difference between Generation and Procession; that One is a new Production (if I may so express it) *inventum, partum, & repertum*, that is the Production of its own Image, of its own Wisdom and Knowledge by Self-reflexion; the other comes out of the Mind, as Love does, and therefore the Mind is the Principle of it, but not its Parent. *Cur itaque amando se non genuisse dicatur amorem suum, sicut cognoscendo se genuit notitiam suam: in eo quidem manifeste ostenditur, hoc amoris esse principium unde procedit: ab ipsa quidem mente procedit, quæ sibi est amabilis antequam se amet: atque ita principium est amoris sui, quo se amat; sed ideo non rectè dicitur genitus ab ea, sicut notitia sui, quæ se novit; quia notitia jam inventum est, quod partum vel repertum dicitur, quod sæpe præcedit inquisitio eo sine quietura.*

This I hope is sufficient both to explain and justify this Doctrine (which is the great Fundamental of the Christian Religion) of a Trinity in Unity, and Unity in Trinity, and that Account I have given of it. It must be confessed, that the ancient Fathers did not express their Sense in the same terms, that I have done, but I will leave any indifferent and impartial Reader to judge, whether they do not seem to have intended the very same Explication, which I have now given of this venerable Mystery.

As for the Schoolmen, they generally pretend to follow the Fathers, and have no Authority, where they leave them: Sometimes they seem to mistake their Sense, or to clog it with some peculiar Niceties and Distinctions of their own. The truth is, that which has confounded this Mystery, has been the vain endeavour of reducing it to terms of Art: such as Na-
ture

ture, Essence, Substance, Subsistence, Hypostasis, Person, and the like, which some of the Fathers used in a very different Sense from each other; which sometimes occasioned great Disputes among them, not because they differed in the Faith, but because they used words so differently, as not to understand each others meaning, as *Petavius* has shewn at large. The more pure and simple Age of the Church contented themselves to profess the Divinity of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; that there was but One God, and Three, who were this One God; which is all the Scripture teaches of it. But when *Sabellius* had turned this Mystery only into a Trinity of Names, they thought themselves concerned to say, what these Three are, who are One God; and then they nicely distinguished between Person and Hypostasis, and Nature and Essence, and Substance, that they were Three Persons, but One Nature, Essence, and Substance; but then when men curiously examined the signification of these words, they found, that upon some account or other they were very unapplicable to this Mystery: for what is the Substance and Nature of God? How can Three distinct Persons have but one Numerical Substance? What is the distinction between Essence, and Personality and Subsistence? The Deity is above Nature, and above terms of Art; there is nothing like this mysterious Distinction and Unity, and therefore no wonder, if we want proper words to express it by, at least that such Names as signify the Distinction and Unity of Creatures, should not reach it. I do not think it impossible to give a tolerable Account of the School-terms and distinctions, but that is a work of greater difficulty than use, especially to ordinary Christians, and I have drawn this Section to too great a length already to enter upon that now.

SECT. VI.

Concerning Expounding Scripture by Reason.

Creed.

FO R like as we are compelled by the Christian Verity to acknowledge every Person by himself to be God and Lord.

So are we forbidden by the Catholick Religion, to say, there be Three Gods and Three Lords.

Notes.

By the Christian Verity I suppose is meant, the Sacred Books which contain the Christian Religion, that is, the Books of the Old and New Testament. But do these Books, and does this Verity compel us to the acknowledgment of Three Persons, each of which, is by himself Supreme God, and Lord, and yet all of them together but One God? Doth, I say, the Holy Scripture compel us to this contradictory acknowledgment? Is there any Text alleadged from Scripture, which all the Unitarians, and some or other of the most learned Trinitarians, do not easily interpret in such Sense, that the Unity of God is preserved, and no more than One Person (even the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ) acknowledged to be God? See the History of the Unitarians. But if there is no Text of Scripture, but what is in the Opinion of some or other of their own Learned Men, fairly capable of a Sense contrary to the Faith delivered in this Creed, then we are not compelled to acknowledge this Faith. And the truth is, the Contest between the Unitarians and Trinitarians is not, as is commonly thought, a Clash of Reason with Scripture; but it layeth here, whether, when the Holy Scripture may be understood as teaching only One God, or but One who is God,

Holy and Ever Blessed TRINITY.

141

God, which agrees with the rest of Scripture, and with Natural Reason, we must notwithstanding prefer an Interpretation of it that is absurd, and contrary to it self, to reason, and to the rest of Scripture, such as the Trinitarians Interpretation (expressed in this Creed) appears to be. In a word, the Question only is, Whether we ought to Interpret Holy Scripture, when it speaks of God, according to Reason, or not, that is, like fools, or like wise men.

There is nothing in this long Paragraph to trouble *Answer.* an Answerers thoughts, but a great deal to exercise his Patience, if he be apt to be provoked by Arrogance and Folly.

His first Argument to prove, that the Holy Scriptures do not compel us to confess each Person in the ever blessed Trinity to be God and Lord, and yet that there is but one God, is because it is a *contradictory acknowledgment*: So he says, and has endeavoured to prove it, and how vainly and impertinently, I leave the Reader to judge; but if a Trinity in Unity imply no Contradiction, as I am persuaded, I have evidently proved; then I hope the Scripture may teach this Doctrine, and require the belief of it: but this is an impudent Argument, which brings Revelation down in such sublime Mysteries to the level of our Understandings, to say, such a Doctrine cannot be contained in Scripture, because it implies a Contradiction; whereas a modest man would first inquire, whether it be in Scripture or not, and if it be plainly contained there, he would conclude, how unintelligible soever it appeared to him, that yet there is no Contradiction in it, because it is taught by Scripture: we must not indeed expound Scripture contrary.

trary to common Sense, and to the common Reason of Mankind, in such Matters as every man knows, and every man can judge of; but in Matters of pure Revelation, which we have no natural Idea of, and know nothing of but what is revealed, we must not pretend some imaginary Contradictions to reject the plain and express Authority of a Revelation; for it is impossible to know, what is a Contradiction to the Natures of Things, whose Natures we do not understand; as I shewed before.

His next Proof, That the Scripture does not compel us to this Acknowledgment, is, that the Unitarians, and some of the most Learned Trinitarians expound these Texts of Scripture, which are alledged for a Trinity in Unity to another Sense, and easily reconcile them with the Belief and Acknowledgment of One only, who is God, as well as of One God; and for this he refers us to that Learned Piece, the History of the Unitarians.

As for examining particular Texts, which are alledged on both sides in this Controversie, it is too voluminous a Work at present, and besides my present Undertaking, which is only to vindicate the *Athanasian Creed*, and the true Christian Doctrine of a Trinity in Unity, from the pretended Absurdities and Contradictions charged on it in these Notes, and when that is done, (and I hope, I have done it) I dare trust any man of competent Understanding to judge which is most agreeable to the Scope and Language of Scripture.

But as for what he says, that the Unitarians or Socinians can easily reconcile all the Texts of Scripture alledged for the proof of a Trinity, to their Notion of One God in opposition to Three Divine Persons

Persons in the Godhead, we must let him say so, because he will say it, as all other Hereticks pretend Scripture to be on their side; but to say, that they can *easily* do this, is a little impudent, when all Men, who understand this Controversie, see what Art they use, and what forced and arbitrary Interpretations they put on Scripture to reconcile it to their Opinions; especially when some of the most learned *Socinians* stick not to confess, That they will expound Scripture to any sense, rather than acknowledge such Doctrines, as they think so contradictory to the Reason and Understanding of Mankind; which no modest Man would own, were he not sensible of the harshness and uncouthness of his own Expositions; for things are come to a desperate pass, when they shall resolve upon any sense, or no sense, rather than that, which the words most aptly and properly signify, but lies cross to their Prejudices and pre-conceived Opinions. But what thinks he of *Socinus's* Exposition of that Text, where Christ says, That *he came down from Heaven*; which he could not do, if he had no being, before he was born of the Virgin *Mary*? Did *Socinus* find it so easie a thing to reconcile this Text to his darling Opinion; when he was fain to fast and to pray for it, and to pretend Revelation, because he wanted Reason to support it? *viz.* That Christ before he entred on his Prophetick Office, was taken up into Heaven to be instructed in the Gospel, and then came down from Heaven again to publish it to the World: Whereas our Saviour plainly speaks of his first coming into the World, when he was born of the Virgin, and the whole History of the Gospel takes no notice of his being taken up into Heaven before his Resurrection from the dead; I think this was no easie Exposition; but of this more presently.

That

That there are no Texts of Scripture alledged for the proof of a Trinity, but what are rejected by one or other of the most learned Trinitarians, is as true as the other: There are many Texts, which all hearty Trinitarians do, and must agree in, and whoever rejects them, whatever name he goes by, can be no better than a Socinian in disguise; but however there are no Texts alledged by learned Trinitarians, but are acknowledged by some or other of his learned Trinitarians, and thus it is as broad as long; but it is not the Authority of any modern Expositors, which we rely on, but their Reason; and if a learned Trinitarian should reject any Text without Reason or Learning, it signifies no more to us, than the Expositions of a learned Socinian: when we seek for Authority we go higher, to the Primitive Fathers of the Catholick Church, and there we find it. They not only delivered to us the traditionary Doctrines of a Trinity, which had always been taught in the Catholick Church, but the Traditionary Exposition of those Scriptures too, whereon this Doctrine is founded; and they being so near the Head and Fountain of Tradition, the Apostolick Age, their Authority is venerable; and a modest and prudent Man will not reject any Interpretation of Scripture, which relates to Articles of Faith, and is unanimously delivered by the Ancient Fathers, if the words in any tolerable construction will bear the sense: for though a Text should fairly bear two different Interpretations, that is most likely to be true, which has been from the beginning taught by the Catholick Church: And I challenge this Author to name any Text, which is alledged for the proof of a Trinity by learned Trinitarians, which has not been used to the same purpose

pose by many, or most, or all the ancient Fathers, who have alleadged these Texts.

But his Conclusion from hence, that therefore the Scripture does not compel us to acknowledge a Trinity in Unity, because the Unitarians, and some or other of the most Learned Trinitarians, expound these Texts to another Sense, is very pleasant, and shows what a great Master of Reason he is: for his Argument is this; the Scripture does not compel us to believe any thing, while there are other men, who expound the Scripture to a contrary Sense; and thus I am sure the Scripture compels us to believe nothing; for it will be hard to name any Text, which concerns any Article of Faith, how plain and express soever it be, but what has been expounded to a contrary Sense by one Heretick or other. I would ask this Author, whether the Scripture compels him to believe but *One God*, in his Sense of it, that is, *but One who is God*? If it does not, why does he believe it, and insist so peremptorily on it, in defiance of the whole Catholick Church? and yet how can the Scripture compel him to this, when the Catholick Church, and the Catholick Doctors in all Ages, have expounded Scripture to a contrary sense, that there are Three Divine Persons, who are this One God? At this rate, when Men differ in their Expositions of Scripture, the Scripture does not compel us to believe either; and thus notwithstanding the Scripture, we may believe nothing. If the Scripture have a determined Sense, we are bound to believe that Sense, and must answer it to God, and to our Saviour, if we do not, ^{but} whoever expounds it otherwise; and therefore when it is said in the Creed, *that we are compelled* (*ἀναγκαζόμεθα* are under a necessity) *by the Christian Verity to acknowledge*

V

each

each Person by himself to be God and Lord; the meaning is, not that men are under any force to believe or acknowledge it, or to expound Scripture to this sense; but that the true Sense and Exposition of Scripture does make this Acknowledgment necessary, if we will believe as the Scripture teaches; and this may be true, whatever the Unitarians, or any Learned Trinitarians teach.

He adds; That *the Contest between the Unitarians and Trinitarians, is not a clash of Reason, with Scripture; but whether we ought to interpret holy Scripture, when it speaks of God according to Reason, or not, that is, like fools, or like wise men.* Now this is all sham, and talacy: for *to expound Scripture by Reason*, may signify two very different things. 1. To use our own Reason to find out the true Sense and Interpretation of Scripture. 2. To expound Scripture in Conformity to the Principles and Maxims of Natural Reason. In the first sense he expounds Scripture according to Reason, who considers the Use and Propriety of Words, the Scope and Design of the place, what goes before, and what follows, and how one place of Scripture is consistent with another, just in the same way as we find out the sense of any Humane Writing; and he who does not thus expound Scripture by Reason, expounds it *like a fool*; that is, if he put such a sense upon it, as the words will not bear, or the scope and design of the Text will not admit, and as no man would think of, who were not prepossessed and prejudiced against what appears to be the plain and obvious Sense of the Text, and whether they, or we, in this sense, expound Scripture according, or contrary, to Reason, *like fools, or like wise men*, shall be examined presently.

As

As for the other Sense of Expounding Scripture according to Reason, that is, in Conformity to the Principles and Maxims of Natural Reason; we allow this too so far, that we must not expound Scripture to such a sense, as contradicts the plain and express Maxims of Natural Reason; for though God reveals such things to us, as Natural Reason could not discover, and cannot comprehend, yet Revelation cannot contradict plain Reason; for Truth can never contradict it self; what is true in Revelation, can never be false in Reason; and what is true by Natural Reason, can never be false in Revelation; but then as I observed before, we must be sure that there is such a Contradiction; it must be evident and express, and not made out of uncertain Consequences, which many times are not owing to the Nature of Things, but to the Imperfection of our own Knowledge: As to keep to the Matter of our present Dispute:

Natural Reason tells us, That there is, and can be, but One Supreme God, the Sovereign Lord of the World, and should any man pretend to prove from Scripture, that there are Three Gods, this would be an express Contradiction to the Natural Belief of One God, and therefore we must reject this Sense of Scripture, as contrary to Reason: but to prove from Scripture, that there is but One God, and that there are Three, who are this One God, this is no Contradiction to Reason, which teaches but One God; for Scripture teaches the same, and all Trinitarians acknowledge the same, and must do so, if they believe the *Athanasian* Creed; and therefore the belief of the Trinity does not contradict the natural belief of One God. Yes, you'll say, that there should be Three Persons, each of which is God, and yet but

One God, is a Contradiction: but what Principle of Natural Reason does it contradict? Reason tells us, that Three Gods cannot be One God, but does Reason tell us, That Three Divine Persons cannot be One God? if my Reason be like other Mens, I am sure, my Reason says nothing at all about it, does neither affirm, nor deny it; and therefore when the Scripture assures us, that there is but One God, as Natural Reason teaches, and that this One God is Three Divine Persons, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, this contradicts nothing which Reason teaches, but adds something, which Natural Reason could not discover, which is the proper use of Revelation. Scripture teaches, that there is but one God, and that there are Three Divine Persons, who are this One God: Reason teaches, that there is but One God, but does not teach that there are Three Divine Persons in the Unity of the Godhead, nor does it teach that there are not; and therefore though the Scripture teaches more than Natural Reason does (which I suppose may be allowed by these Adorers of Reason) yet it teaches nothing contrary to what Natural Reason teaches; nay, these men can not graft any Contradiction upon it, without perverting the Faith of the ever blessed Trinity, as it is taught in Scripture, and has always been taught in the Catholick Church: that is, to find a Contradiction, their business is to prove, that these Three Divine Persons, each of which is God, must be Three distinct Gods, and then Three distinct Gods cannot be One God: this I grant, and their Argument is unanswerable to those, who own these Three Divine Persons, to be Three distinct Gods, but what is that to us, who teach, that they are not Three distinct Gods, but One God, as the Scripture teaches, and

and the Catholick Church always taught, and as of necessity we must teach, if we believe a Trinity in Unity? so that there is no Contradiction in our Faith, for that which they make a Contradiction is not our Faith, but a Contradiction to our Faith, as well as to common Sense and Reason. Well! but if we believe Three distinct Divine Persons, each of which is God, we must believe Three distinct Gods: I hope not, when we profess to believe but One God; yes, whatever we profess to believe, Three such distinct Persons, must be Three Gods; now this we deny, and challenge them to produce any plain Principle of Reason to prove, that it must be so; Natural Reason teaches nothing about the Personality of the Godhead; it teaches One God, but whether this One God, be One or Three Persons, it says not, and therefore it may be either, without contradicting the Natural Notions we have of One God; and then here is free scope for Revelation, and if Revelation teaches, that there is but One God, and that there are Three Divine Persons, each of which in Scripture have not only the Title, but the Nature and Attributes of God ascribed to them, then we must of necessity believe a Trinity in Unity; Three Persons and One God; for what the Scripture affirms, and Reason does not deny, is a proper Object of our Faith: and then their Objection against this Faith, that these Three Divine Persons, must be Three distinct Gods, if each of them be God, is senseless and ridiculous; for it is demonstrable, that if there be Three Persons and One God, each Person must be God, and yet there cannot be Three distinct Gods, but One. For if each Person be not God, all Three cannot be God, unless the Godhead have Persons in it, which are not God; and if all
Three

Three are but One God, they cannot be Three distinct Gods: so that whoever believes the Three Divine Persons to be Three distinct Gods, does not believe a Trinity in Unity; and whoever believes a Trinity in Unity, cannot believe Three distinct Gods, and if there be a Trinity in Unity, each Person must be God, and yet there cannot be Three Gods, but One God; and now let him go look for his Contradiction in the belief of Three Persons, and one God, and when he has found it, let me hear from him again.

So that all his Absurdities and Contradictions are vanished only into *Nicodemus* his Question, *How can these things be?* and if I could give him no other Answer, I should think it a very good one to say, *God knows.* Must we deny every thing that we can't conceive and comprehend, though it be expressly taught by God himself; Must we deny what we read in the Bible to be there, because Reason does not teach it, and cannot frame an Adequate Idea of it?

But I have not done with our Author thus, but must give him a little more about expounding Scripture according to Reason: For I affirm, that Natural Reason is not the Rule and Measure of Expounding Scripture, no more than it is of Expounding any other Writing. The true and only way to interpret any Writing, even the Scriptures themselves, is to examine the use and propriety of Words and Phrases, the Connexion, Scope, and Design of the Text, its Allusion to ancient Customs and Usages, or Disputes, &c. for there is no other good Reason to be given for any Exposition, but that the Words signify so, and the Circumstances of the Place, and the apparent Scope of the Writer requires it.

But

But our Author (as many others do) seems to confound the Reasons of believing any Doctrine, with the Rules of Expounding a Writing. We must believe nothing that contradicts the plain and express Dictates of Natural Reason, which all Mankind agree in, whatever pretence of Revelation there be for it; well, say they, then you must expound Scripture so as to make it agree with the necessary Principles and Dictates of Reason: No, say I, that does not follow; I must expound Scripture according to the use and signification of the Words, and must not force my own Sense on it, if it will not bear it. But suppose then, that the Natural Construction of the Words import such a Sense, as is contrary to some evident Principle of Reason? then I won't believe it. How? not believe Scripture? no, no, I will believe no pretended Revelation, which contradicts the plain Dictates of Reason, which all Mankind agree in, and were I perswaded, that those Books, which we call the Holy Scriptures did so, I would not believe them; and this is a fairer and honefter way, than to force them to speak, what they never intended, and what every impartial man, who reads them, must think was never intended, that we may believe them: to put our own sense on Scripture, without respect to the use of Words, and to the Reason and Scope of the Text, is not to believe Scripture, but to make it; is not to learn from Scripture, but to teach it to speak our Language; is not to submit to the Authority of Scripture, but to make Scripture submit to our Reason, even in such Matters as are confessedly above Reason, as the infinite Nature and Essence of God is.

Though

Though I am never so well assured of the Divine Authority of any Book, yet I must expound it, as I do other Writings; for when God vouchsafes to speak to us in our own Language, we must understand his Words just as we do, when they are spoke by men: Indeed when I am sure that it is an inspired Writing, I lay it down for a Principle, that it contains nothing absurd and contradictory, or repugnant to the received Principles of Natural Reason; but this does not give me authority to Expound the Words of Scripture to any other sense, than what they will naturally bear, to reconcile them with such Notions, as I call reason; for if one man has this liberty, another may take it, and the Scripture will be tuned to every mans private Conceits; and therefore in case the plain sense of Scripture contradicts those Notions I have of things, if it be possible to be true, I submit to the Authority of Scripture; if it seems to include a Contradiction and Impossibility, if that Contradiction be not plain and notorious, and in such Matters, as I am sure, I perfectly understand, there I submit again, and conclude it is no Contradiction, though I cannot comprehend how it is; if I can by no means reconcile it, I will confess, I do not understand it, and will not pretend to give any Sense of it, much less to give such a Sense of it, as the Words will not bear.

This shows, that men may pretend to Expound Scripture according to Reason, when he Dispute is nothing else, but *a Clash of Reason with Scripture*, as this Author phrases it: for so it is, when the usual signification of the Words, and the Scope and Circumstances of the Place require one Sense, and men force another Sense on it, upon pretence of Expounding

ing Scripture by Reason, that is, to reconcile Scripture to their pre-conceived Notions and Opinions of Things: for what the Words signifie, that is the Sense of Scripture; and when they will not admit this Sense, because they apprehend it contrary to Reason, though most agreeable to the Words and Scope of the Place, that is nothing else but a Controversie between Scripture and Reason.

My present Undertaking does not oblige me to examine all the Scriptures, which are alleadged by the *Socinians* against the Doctrine of the Trinity, or by others for it; this is a voluminous Work, and has often been done by others, and if there were any just Occasion of doing it again, it deserves a Treatise by it self: but indeed it is the Doctrine it self, which the *Socinians* dislike, more then our Expositions, which they cannot deny to be reasonable enough, were the Doctrine so; but they must not expound Scripture contrary to Reason, and therefore must never allow, that the Scripture teaches such a Doctrine, which they think contradicts the plain and self-evident Reason of Mankind; reconcile men to the Doctrine, and the Scripture is plain without any farther Comment; this I have now endeavoured, and I believe our Adversaries will talk more sparingly of Absurdities and Contradictions for the future, and then they will loose the best Argument they have against the Orthodox Expositions of Scripture: but yet I am unwilling to dismiss this Argument, without some few Observations about the Sense of Scripture.

This Author refers us to the History of the *Unitarians*, which though it be but a little Book in all Senses, is too large to be particularly examined now; but however I shall give some taste of it. In the first

Letter the Author marshals those Texts, which he thinks overthrow the Doctrine of the Trinity, and because this may be most dangerous to unskillful Readers, I shall more particularly examine that. He reduces the Scriptures under several Topicks, or Heads of Arguments.

History of Unitarians, P 4.5

I. *If our Lord Christ were himself God, there could be no Person greater than he; none that might be called his Head or God, none that could in any respect command him.* Now this Argument is fallacious, for though Christ be God himself, yet if there be Three Persons in the Godhead, the equality and sameness of Nature does not destroy the Subordination of Persons: a Son is equal to his Father by Nature, but inferior to him as his Son: if the Father, as I have explained it, be Original Mind and Wisdom, the Son a personal, subsisting, but reflex Image of his Fathers Wisdom, though their Eternal Wisdom be equal and the same, yet the Original is superior to the Image, the Father to the Son: and therefore though I know such Texts as he alleadges, *My Father is greater than I. The Head of Christ is God. I ascend to my Father and your Father, to my God and your God;* are both by Ancient and Modern Expositors applied to Christ's Human Nature; yet I see no Inconvenience in owning this to be true with respect to his Divine Person, and his Relation to his Father: For the Father is the Head and Fountain of the Deity, and the Son is God of God, and therefore the Father may be called his God.

14 John 28.
1 Cor. 11. 3.
20 John 17.

12 John 49.
24 31.

As for Christ's receiving Commands from the Father, though this relates to the Execution of his Mediatorial Office, and so concerns him as God Incarnate,

as

as by the Dispensation of the Gospel, he is the Minister of God's Will and Pleasure, yet I grant even as God, he receives Commands from his Father, but it is no otherwise than as he receives his Nature from him: by Nature he is the Word, the Wisdom, the Command of the Father; his reflex Image, whereby he produces all the Designs of his own Wisdom, and Counsel into act. Thus St. *Austin* answered the *Arrian* Objection, That Christ was but God's Instrument, and made the World by God's Command. *Let them consider with what other words the Father commanded his only Word. But they frame to themselves an Imagination of two, near one another, but separated by their distinct Places, one commanding, another obeying. Nor do they understand, that the Fathers Command it self, that all things should be made, is no other Word of the Father, but that by which all things are made; that is, the substantial Word and Wisdom, and Command of the Father, his only begotten Son.*

cogitent quibus aliis verbis iussit Pater unico verbo: Formant enim sibi in phantasmate cordis sui, quasi duos aliquos, etsi iuxta invicem, in suis tamen locis constitutos, unum jubentem, alteram obtemperantem. Nec intelligunt ipsam iussionem Patris ut fierent omnia, non esse nisi verbum Patris, per quod facta sunt omnia. Aug. contr. Sermon. Arrianorum, Lib. 3.

2. *If our Lord Christ were indeed God, it could not, Page 5.*
without blasphemy, be (absolutely and without Restriction) affirmed of him, that he is the Creature, the Possession, the Servant, and Subject of God. It is well he added, absolutely and without restriction, but he had done better, if he had remembered it in his Proofs: that Christ is called a Creature, he proves, because he is the first-born of every Creature, but here he should have remembered his absolutely and without restriction, for he is so to the first-born of every Creature, that he is the Image of the Invisible God,

1 Col. 1.

1 Col. 17.

and therefore no Creature ; so born before all Creatures, as *πρωτόγονος* also signifies, *That by him were all things created, that are in Heaven, and that are in Earth visible and invisible, whether they be Thrones, or Dominions, or Principalities, or Powers ; all things were created by him and for him, and he is before all things,* (which is the Explication of *πρωτόγονος* *πρὸς αὐτὸν ὡς ὁ ἀρχὴς*, begotten before the whole Creation, and therefore no part of the Creation himself) *and by him all things consist, καὶ πάντα ἐς αὐτὸν συνέστηκεν*, all things were not only made by him, but have their Subistence in him ; as the Apostle tells us, *in God we live and move and have our being*, that this does not relate to the new Creation, as the Socinians would have it, is very plain : For 1. in this Sense Christ (if he were meer Man) was not the first-born of every new Creature ; for I hope there were a great many new Creatures, that is, truly good and pious men, before Christ was born of his Virgin Mother. 2. Nor in this sense were all things in Heaven and Earth visible and invisible, Thrones, Dominions, Principalities, and Powers, that is, all the Orders of Angels created by him : For the greatest part of visible things, (especially in the Apostles days, when so little part of the World was converted to the Christian Faith) were not new made by him ; and none of the invisible things were new made by him : good Angels did not need it, and he came not to convert fallen Angels, but to destroy the visible Kingdom of the Devil in this World, and to judge them in the next. 3. Nor in this sense were all things made *for him* ; for he is a Mediator for God, to reduce Mankind to their Obedience and Subjection to him ; and therefore when he has accomplished his Work of Mediation, and destroyed

stroyed all Enemies; in the final Judgment of the World; he shall deliver up his Kingdom to his Father, that God may be all in all; of which more presently.

4. And therefore the Apostle proceeds from his Creation of the Natural World, to his Mediator Kingdom, which proves, that he did not speak of that before: *And he is the Head of the Body the Church, who is the beginning, the first-born from the dead, that in all things he might have the prebeminence:* as the Maker of all things visible and invisible, he is said to be before all things, begotten of his Father before the Creation of the World; as Head of the Church, he is ἀρχὴ also, the beginning, the first who rose from the dead, that he might be the πρωτόγεννητος, the first upon all Accounts; before the Worlds, and the first-born from the dead. That he was God's Minister and Servant, he proves by several Texts: as that he was appointed or made (which has the same sense) by God, *the Apostle and High-Priest of our Profession:* but here is a restriction to his being High-Priest, and therefore no danger of Blasphemy, though he be God: for we may observe, that though the Jewish High-Priest were but a man, yet he was a Type of a High-Priest, who is more than man, even the Eternal Son and Word of God, as some of the Learned Jews acknowledge; for the Son of God is the only proper Mediator and Advocate with the Father; as *Philo Judæus* often calls the λόγος or Word, the ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς or High-Priest; and shows that the Garments of the High-Priest were Figures of Heaven and Earth, which seems to signify, that the Eternal Word, which made the world, is the true High-Priest. And the Story *Josephus* tells of *Alexander* looks this way; that when *Jaddus* the High-Priest went out to meet him, dressed in

Verse 14.

Page 6.

3 Hebr. 1, 2.

A Vindication of the Doctrine of the

in all his Pontifical Attire, he approached him with great Reverence and Veneration, and his Captains wondering at it, he told them, That that God, who appeared to him, and sent him upon that Expedition, and promised him Victory and Success, appeared to him in that very Habit. I am sure the Apostle distinguishes Christ from *High-Priests taken from among men*; and makes his Sonship the Foundation of his Priesthood. *Christ glorified not himself to be made an High-Priest* (which shows that it is no Servile Ministry) *but he that said unto him, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten Thee.* As he saith also in another place, *Thou art a Priest for ever after the Order of Melchizedec.* And what the Mystery of this *Melchizedecian Priesthood* was, he explains 7 *Hebrews*, that *Melchizedec was first by Interpretation King of Righteousness, and after that also, King of Salem, which is King of Peace. Without Father, without Mother, without Descent, having neither beginning of days, nor end of life, but made like unto the Son of God, which is a Priest continually.*

5 Hebr. 1.

5, 6.

7 Hebr. 2. 3.

1 Cor. 3. 23.

As for his next Quotation, that *Christ is Gods*, I know not what he means by it; for there is no doubt but Christ is God's Son, God's Christ, God's High-Priest, serves the ends and designs of God's Glory; and what then? therefore he is not God? By no means! he may conclude, that therefore he is not God the Father, because he acts subordinately, not that therefore he is not God the Son.

12 Matth. 17,
18.

His next Proof is, that God calls him *his Servant* by the Prophet *Isaiab*; but it is his Servant *in whom his Soul is well-pleased*; which is the peculiar Character of his Son; and is that very testimony which God

God gave to Christ at his Baptism by a voice from Heaven; *This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased.* 3 Matth. 17.

His next Proof is, that *he humbled himself, and became obedient*, which is all he cites; but what does he prove from this? that Obedience is part of his Humiliation? And what then? therefore he is not God? because he voluntarily condescends below the Dignity of his Nature, does he forfeit the Dignity of his Nature? and yet this is the plain Case, as the Apostle tells us in that place: that *He being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God, but made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men, and being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the Cross.* And this is a wonderful Proof, that he is not God, because *being in the form of God*, that is, being God, he voluntarily condescended to the meanest and most servile state of Human Nature for the Salvation of sinners. But the sting of all is behind, that for this submission and obedience he was rewarded and exalted by God, and a God is not capable of a reward or exaltation, being Supreme himself, and yet as it follows, for this *God hath highly exalted him, and given him a Name above every Name.* 2 Phil 8.9.

Now it seems very strange to me, that Christ's advancement to the supreme Government of the World, should be made an Argument against his being God, or the Eternal Son of God: for is it fitting and congruous for God to make a meer Creature the Universal Lord and Sovereign of the World? to advance a meer man above the most glorious Angels, to be the Head of all Principalities and Powers, which would be

be an Indignity to the Angelical Nature? is a meer Creature a fit Lieutenant or Representative of God in Personal or Prerogative Acts of Government and Power? must not every Being be represented by one of his own Kind, a Man by a Man, an Angel by an Angel, in such Acts as are proper to their Natures? and must not God then be represented by One, who is God? Is any Creature capable of the Government of the world? does not this require infinite Wisdom and infinite Power? and can God communicate infinite Wisdom and infinite Power to a Creature, or a finite Nature? that is, can a Creature be made a true and essential God? if our Adorers of Reason can digest such Contradictions as these, I hope they will never complain of Absurdities and Contradictions more. A God without infinite Perfections, is only a Titular and Nominal God, and to say, that Creatures may have all the Perfections of God, is to say, that God can make an infinite Creature, which has a thousand times greater Contradictions, than the most absurd Explication of the Trinity can be charged with; for then a true and real God may be a Creature; then the Divine Nature is not eternal, but may be created; then the Divine Nature is not numerically One, but if the first God so pleased, he could make a world of Gods, as well as of Angels, or Men. If then this Kingdom to which Christ is advanced, cannot be administered without infinite Wisdom and Power, then he is by Nature a God; for otherwise all Power in Heaven and Earth could not have been committed to him, because he was not capable of it, could not administer it: and would God choose a King, who could not administer the Government of the World, nor do any thing towards it?

And

And yet the Difficulty remains; if he be by Nature the Son of God, and the Natural Lord of the World, how is he said to be exalted by God, and to receive a Kingdom from him as the Reward of his Sufferings? when he was already possessed of it, ever since the Foundations of the World, being the Natural Lord of all Creatures; and therefore had no need to receive that which was his own, or purchase what was his Natural Right, by such mean and vile Condescensions, as suffering Death upon the Cross.

And therefore rightly to understand this, we must consider the Nature of Christ's Kingdom; that it is not merely the Natural Government of the World, but a Mediatory Kingdom. God is the Supreme and Natural Lord of the World, King of Kings, and Lord of Lords, and the only Ruler of Princes: and while God governed the World only as its Natural Lord, the Son had no distinct Kingdom of his own, but in Conjunction with his Father. For though there always were Three Divine Persons in the Godhead, yet the Father being the Fountain of the Deity, the Government of the World was administered in his Name.

But Mankind quickly Apostatized from God, forfeited immortal Life, corrupted their Manners, and defaced the Image of God upon their Souls, and the Government of God considered only as our Maker and Sovereign Lord could give no hope nor security to guilty sinners; and this made a Mediatory Kingdom necessary, to reconcile God and Men, and to restore Man to the Integrity of his Nature: and this Power and Dignity God bestowed upon his own Son, who had the most right to it, and was best qualified for it, being the begotten Word and

Wisdom of the Father: but he must first become man, and publish the Will of God to the World, and make Expiation for Sin, and then he should rise again from the dead, and set down at the right hand of God.

And therefore we may observe, that all this Power Christ is invested with, is as Head of the Church.

1 Eph 22, 23. *God hath put all things under his feet, and given him to be Head over all things to the Church, which is his Body, the fulness of him, which filleth all in all.* That

is, he has made him the Governour of the whole World, as Head of the Church. For the Salvation of Mankind required the Government of the World to be put into his Hands, that he might restrain the Power and Malice of wicked Spirits, and destroy the Kingdom of Darkness, and imploy good Angels in the Service and Ministeries of his Church, as the

1 Heb. 14. *Apostle tells us, They are ministering Spirits, sent forth to minister for them, who shall be heirs of Salvation.* That the Government of this lower World might be administered by him with a peculiar regard and subserviency to the great ends of his Spiritual Kingdom. For the Church of Rome is so far in the right, that the Supreme Head of the Church must be Supreme in Temporals too *in ordine ad spiritualia*; but their fault is, they give this Power to a vicarious Head, which is due only, and can be administered only by Christ, who is the true Supreme Head of all things to his Church.

The Government of Israel was a Type of this. The Kingdom of Israel was originally a pure Theocracy; God was their King, and governed them almost as visibly by his Priest, his Oracles, his Judges, whom he extraordinarily raised up, as a Temporal King

King governs his Subjects. But in time they grew weary of the Government of God, and desired a King like other Nations: upon which God tells *Samuel*, *They have not rejected thee, but rejected me, that I should not reign over them.* But yet he complies with their Desires in giving them a King; and their King was peculiarly God's Anointed, and God's King, who ruled God's People and Inheritance by God's peculiar and delegated Authority: for the Government of *Israel* did not cease to be a Theocracy, when they had a King; for they were God's People and Inheritance still; but now the King was between God and the People, whereas God governed them more immediately before. And therefore as *David* was a Type of Christ, so his Kingdom was typical of the Kingdom of Christ; *Yet have I set my King upon my holy Hill of Sion*; which seems to have some aspect on *David*; though it received its just Accomplishment in Christ: and hence the Kingdom of the Messiah is called *the Throne of his Father David*; not that Temporal Kingdom which *David* governed, for *his Kingdom was not of this World*; but that of which *David's* Kingdom was a Type and Figure, the Government of the Church, who are God's People, of whom the carnal *Israel* was a Type, which he rules by a vicarious, but a Sovereign Authority, for God, and in his name and stead. This gives a plain account, how God may give this Kingdom to his Son, and that as the Reward of his Sufferings. It may be a Gift, because it is not a Natural Right; for it is not a Natural Kingdom, but erected by the Wisdom and Counsel of God, for the Salvation of Sinners; and it must be the Reward of his Sufferings, because it is a Sacerdotal Kingdom, which is founded in the Expiation of his Blood.

1 Sam. 8. 7.

2 Psalm 6.

1 Luke 32.

18 John 35.

And though Christ be the Eternal Son of God, and the Natural Lord and Heir of all things, yet *God hath in this highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name, that at (or in &c) the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in Heaven, and things in Earth, and things under the Earth, and that every tongue, (some of all Nations, Languages, and Tongues) shall confess, that Jesus Christ is Lord to the glory of God the Father.* For when God exalts and magnifies himself, or exalts his Son, it does not, and cannot signify any addition or increase of their essential Greatness and Glory, for neither the Father nor the Son can be greater than they are; but yet God is exalted, when his Greatness and Power is more visible, and more universally acknowledged and adored: and thus God has highly exalted his Son too, by conferring the Mediatory Power and Kingdom on him; as to shew this particularly, but briefly.

This makes the Son more universally known, acknowledged, and adored. The Notion and Belief of one God is Natural to Mankind; that there are three Divine Persons, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, in the Unity of the Godhead, is not known by Nature, but by Revelation: There are some obscure hints and intimations of this even in the History of the Creation; more plain in the Types and Prophecies of the Jewish Law, which relate to the Messiah; and possibly this was more particularly explained in their Cabala, which some learned men industriously prove contained this Mystery of the Trinity: but all this while, this Mystery was very obscure, and the Glory of the Son little known in the World: for though now we certainly know from the Exposition of Christ
and

and his Apostles, that the Prophets spake of Christ under the name of Lord, and God, and Jehovah, yet all went in the Name of God. But when Christ appeared in the World, then God owned him for his Son; *this is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased;* ³ *Match. 16.* Christ owned himself for the Son of God, his only ³ *John 16, 17.* begotten Son: and upon all occasions calls God his Father, and that in such a distinguishing manner, that the Jews understood him to mean, that he was the Son of God by Nature, and charge him with Blasphemy for making himself God. He appealed ¹⁰ *Joh. 29, 30,* to those mighty Works he did in his Father's Name, ^{32, 37, 38.} to prove the Truth of what he taught them, that he was indeed the Son of God.

But then God visibly owned him for his Son, when he raised him from the dead, and bestowed a Kingdom on him, a Name which is above every Name, as St. Paul tells us, *That he was declared to be the Son* ¹ *Rom. 5.* *of God with power according to the Spirit of Holiness, by the Resurrection from the Dead.* And for this reason, that of the Psalmist, *Thou art my Son, this day* ² *Psalm 7.* *have I begotten Thee,* is applied to the Resurrection of Christ from the Dead. *We deliver unto you* ¹³ *Acts 32, 33.* *glad tidings, how that the promise that was made to the Fathers, God hath fulfilled the same to us their Children, in that he hath raised up Jesus again; as it is also written in the second Psalm, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten Thee.* Which it is plain does not signify, that God then first begot him; for he owned him for his beloved Son long before, at his Baptism; and Christ calls himself his only begotten Son long before; and the Socinians themselves attribute his Sonship to his miraculous Conception in the Womb of the Virgin; and St. Paul, we see, expounds
God's

God's begetting him at his Resurrection, by his being declared the Son of God by the Resurrection from the Dead, which supposes he was his Son before, and that not *κατὰ σάρκα* according to the Flesh, for so he was the Seed of David, but *κατὰ πνεῦμα* according to the Spirit of Holiness, or his Divine Nature, for so its opposition to *κατὰ σάρκα* proves it must signify. He was the only begotten Son of God from eternal Ages, but the World did not fully know him to be so, till God declared this by his Resurrection from the Dead, and by bestowing a Kingdom on him; and then he visibly appeared in the Glory and Majesty of the Son of God, as if he had been begotten by him that day: and this seems to be the meaning of our Saviour's Prayer; *And now, O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self, with that glory which I had with Thee, before the World was;* that is, now publicly own me to be thy Son, which I always was, but was never yet sufficiently declared so to the World. And therefore when he was raised from the Dead, and advanced into his Kingdom, which he was to administer, not by Human Force and Power, but by the Power of the Divine Spirit, it was time to let the World know this great Mystery of a Trinity in Unity, because each Divine Person has his distinct and proper part in this mysterious œconomy: and therefore he commands

John 5.

28 Matth. 19.

his Disciples to *Baptize in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost*, that is, into the belief and worship of One God, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost: of which more presently.

But this is not all: the Son is not only now made known and manifest to the World, and publicly owned by his Father, but he has a peculiar Authority invested

invested in him, distinct both from the Father and the Holy Spirit, as he is a Mediatory King.

There being but One Supreme and Sovereign God, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, who are but One Energy and Power, but One Monarchy, but One Maker, and One Lord of the World; in the Natural Government of the World there is no distinction of the Divine Persons; no peculiar Offices and Administrations to distinguish them; not one thing done by the Father, another by the Son, and a third by the Holy Ghost, but the whole Trinity made and governs the World by One individual Operation; and therefore the Creation and Government of the World is the Work of One God, and therefore peculiarly attributed to the Father, who is the Fountain of the Deity, who is that Original Mind and Wisdom, who made; and who governs the World by his Son and holy Spirit; so that in the Natural Government of the World, the Son has no Kingdom of his own, but reigns as One Supreme God with the Father and the Holy Spirit, and all attributed to the Father as the beginning of Energy and Power.

But in the economy of man's Salvation, the Son has a Kingdom of his own, which is peculiarly his, administered in his Name, and by his Sovereign Authority. The Father is atoned by him, and has committed to him all Power both in Heaven and in Earth: ^{28 March.} He is made the Head of all Principalities and Powers, which are now immediately subjected to him, and must receive their Commands and Orders from him; as the Apostle to the Hebrews tells us, *when God brought* ^{Hebr. 1. 3} *etc. in the flesh begotten into the World, that is, when God raised him from the dead, and received him into Heaven, to sit at his right hand; he saith, and I will* ^{Hebr. 1. 13} *the*

the Angels of God worship him: obey his Commands, and be his Ministers and Servants. The Holy Spirit is given by him, he sends the Spirit to dwell in his Church, which is his Body, and to animate all the true and sincere Members of it; He governs this lower World, disposes of Kingdoms and Empires in suberviency to the ends of his Spiritual Kingdom: He has the Power of pardoning sins, of judging the World, of raising the dead; whom he pardons, God pardons; whom he condemns, God condemns; for the Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment to the Son. Should the Father judge the World, he must judge as the Maker and Sovereign Lord of the World, by the strict Rules of Righteousness and Justice, and then how could any sinner be saved? but he has committed Judgment to the Son, as a Mediatory King, who judges by the Equity and Chancery of the Gospel.

- The Power indeed whereby he administers his Kingdom, is the Power of the whole Trinity, of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; for they being essentially One God, have but one Energy and Power, and therefore can never act separately: and therefore the Resurrection of Christ from the Dead is ascribed to God the Father, *God raised him from the dead: to*
- 2 Acts 24. 13, 30. *Christ himself, as he tells the Jews, Destroy this Temple, and in three days I will raise it up. And, I lay down*
- 2] John 19. *my life, that I may take it again. I have power to lay it*
10. 17, 18. *down, and I have power to take it again. And to the Holy Spirit, If the Spirit of him that raised up Christ from the dead dwell in you; he that raised up Christ from the dead, shall also quicken your mortal bodies by the Spirit that dwelleth in you. Where God indeed*
- 8 Rom. 11. *is said to raise up Christ from the dead, but it was by his*
- his

his Spirit, and by the same Spirit he will raise us.

But yet this is the Kingdom of Christ, because now the Administration and Exercise of this Power is committed to him, and is as it were under his direction and influence. The Natural Kingdom and Government of the World is peculiarly attributed to God the Father, though the Son and Holy Ghost reign with him as one God: because the Father is Original Mind and Wisdom, and therefore the beginning of all Power and Energy. As the Father begets the Son, not the Son the Father, and the Holy Ghost proceeds from Father and Son, not Father and Son from the Holy Ghost; so the Son and Holy Ghost will and act with the Father, not the Father with the Son and the Holy Ghost; that is, if we may so speak where there is but One individual Act and Energy, the Father is the first Mover in the Sacred Trinity: For reflex Wisdom, that is the Son, who is begotten Wisdom, moves and acts, at it is begotten, by Original Mind and Wisdom, who is the eternal Father; as Christ himself tells us; *The Son can do no-^s John 19. thing of himself, but what he seeth the Father do; for whatsoever things he doth, these also doth the Son likewise.* And my Father worketh hitherto, and I work: But the Father is the Principle and Beginning of Action; and therefore the Government and Monarchy must receive its Denomination from him; that it is the Kingdom of the Father.

But now in the Mediatorial Kingdom, the exercise of the Divine Power is committed into the hands of the Mediator, and is administered by the measures and terms of his Mediation. The Power is not taken out of God's hands, for that is impossible; Father, Son, and Holy Ghost govern the World still by One

individual Act and Power, but as in the Natural Government of the World the Exercise of this Power begins with the Father, so in this Mediatory Kingdom it begins with the Son, and is directed by his Mediation: that is, God governs the World now, not merely as a Natural Lord, by the Rules of Natural Justice, but with respect to the Mediatory Power and Authority of his Son, and to serve the ends of his Mediatory Kingdom.

Now the Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all Judgment to the Son; He hath power to save and to destroy; whom he pardons, God pardons; whom he condemns, God condemns; all Petitions are put up to God in his Name; all Blessings, both temporal and spiritual, are obtained from God in his Name: that is, it is the Name and Authority of Christ by which God now governs the World. This is the Name God has given him, which is above every Name, that at the Name of Jesus every knee should bow, both of things in Heaven, and things on Earth, and things under the Earth: and that every Tongue should confess, that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the Glory of God the Father. That Angels in Heaven move at his Command, and obey his Power; that Men on Earth worship God, and expect all from him in his Name; that evil Spirits tremble at his Name, and yield to his Power; and that all the World confess the Supreme and Sovereign Authority of the Son, to the Glory of the Father, who hath thus highly exalted him.

2 Phil. 9, 10, 11.

There can be no other meaning but this, in what Christ tells his Disciples after his Resurrection from the Dead; *All Power is given unto me both in Heaven and Earth.* For unless it be some Power, which he

28 Matth. 18.

he had not before as the Eternal Son of God, how can it be said to be now given unto him; and yet before, in conjunction with, and subordination to his Father, he had all Power both in Heaven and Earth; but then this Power was not in his own Name, nor seated immediately in himself, as his own Personal Authority; but now the Son is immediately invested with this Power and Authority as a Mediatory King.

And this is the meaning of what he tells us; *As the Father hath life in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself.* To have life in himself, is to have the Power and Authority of bestowing Life, as appears both from what goes before, and from what follows: *As the Father raiseth up the dead and quickneth them, so the Son quickneth whom he will. Verily, verily, I say unto you, the hour is coming, and now is, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God, and they that hear shall live. Marvel not at this, for the hour is coming, in the which all that are in the Graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good to the Resurrection of Life, and they that have done evil, unto the Resurrection of Damnation.* This Power the Son always had as begotten of his Father, from all Eternity, and One God with him; but he here speaks of a Personal Authority, which is given him as the Son of Man, as an Incarnate and Mediatory King, *And hath given him Authority to execute Judgment also, because he is the Son of Man.* And therefore now it is given him to have Life in himself, as the Father hath Life in himself: The Father hath Life in himself, as the Original Fountain of all Life, by whom the Son himself lives; all Life is derived from God,

6 John 57.

either by eternal Generation, or Proceſſion, or Creation; and thus Chriſt hath Life in himſelf alſo, in the new Creation he is the Fountain of Life; *he quickeneth whom he will; he is the bread of life, that came down from Heaven; if any man eat of this bread, he ſhall live for ever. As the living Father hath ſent me, and I live by the Father, ſo, he that eateth me, even he ſhall live by me. I am the Reſurrection and the Life; he that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet ſhall he live; and whoſoever liveth and believeth in me, ſhall never dye.* This is the Authority of his Mediatory Kingdom, which he hath received from his Father, that he hath Life in himſelf, and hath Authority and Power to give Life to the World.

51.

57.

11 John 25,

26

This is a Kingdom in a Kingdom, the Mediatory Kingdom of the Son in the Natural Kingdom of the Father, which reſtrains the Father's Juſtice, diſpenſes his Grace, and directs the Exerciſe of his Power in the Government of the World, which though it be upon theſe accounts a Superiour Authority, and therefore a high Exaltation of the Son, yet it is no diminution to the Father: *The confeſſing Jeſus Chriſt to be Lord, is to the glory of God the Father.*

17 John 28.

5. 43.

3. John 30.

8. 42.

50.

12. 44.

6. 38.

1. Becauſe this Mediatory Kingdom is erected by the Father, and by the Father given to the Son; it is he, *who gave him this Authority, becauſe he is the Son of Man.* And therefore Chriſt every where owns, that he was ſent by God. *I am not come of my ſelf; I am come in my Fathers Name. I proceeded forth, and came from God, neither came I of my ſelf, but he ſent me. I ſeek not my own will. I ſeek not my own glory. I came not to do my own will, but the will of him*

him that sent me. Which Scriptures make up the fourth Argument in the *History of the Unitarians* against Christ's being God; because Almighty God doth all things in his own Name, and by his own Authority; but Christ comes in the Father's Name, and does his will, and seeks his glory. Which proves indeed, that he receives this Power from the Father, that he fulfils his will, and serves his glory in it; but if he receive this Kingdom, he has it, and a very glorious Kingdom it is, in some respects superiour to the Natural Government of God, as it sets bounds to it. But this only proves, that he is not the Father, but the Son, and the King of God; and this Authority being given him of the Father, to reduce Mankind to their Obedience, it is no lessening of the Fathers Authority, from whom he receives this Mediatory Power.

2. This can be no Diminution to the Father, because he is his only begotten Son; One God with himself, *the brightness of his glory, and the express Image of his Person*; the Natural Heir of his Power and Greatness, and the Natural Lord of the World. As a Son, he is by Nature equal to his Father, but yet subordinate, and therefore cannot be his Rival; as a Son, his advancement is the glory of the Father, *that* John 23. *all men should honour the Son, as they honour the Father*; and therefore it is no derogation to the Father, though he commit to the Son a more glorious Authority, then he exercises himself; the Authority of a Mediatory Kingdom, or Sovereign Grace, which is a more glorious Authority to Sinners, then Natural Justice and Dominion: for all men know, a Son must receive all from his Father, and if the Father, for wise Reasons, of which more presently, give the Son

Son the more glorious Power, it is the Father, who is glorified in it : As he is God , the Eternal Son of God, and One with the Father, he is the proper Object of Religious Worship ; and therefore all those Divine Honours and Adorations, which are paid him upon account of his Mediatory Kingdom and Power, are no Injury to the Divine Nature , as they would have been, had God conferred this Power on a Creature ; which had been to give his glory to another, which God detests, and declares his abhorrence of, and which all *Arians* and *Socinians* do, who worship Christ, believing him to be only a Creature, or a meer Man. The Command in Scripture to worship him, and pay Divine Honours to him, is a much better Argument to prove that he is God, then to justify the worship of any Creature ; which God universally prohibits, and is a much greater Contradiction to the Principles of Natural Religion, than a Trinity in Unity is to Natural Reason.

3. To this we must add, That his Kingdom is the Reward of his Obedience and Sufferings, that is, it is founded in the Expiation of his Blood: Is an Authority to dispence that Grace and Mercy which he has purchased with his Blood : so that his Kingdom and Power is founded in the most perfect submission to his Father, is the Reward of his Obedience, whereby he glorified his Father on Earth ; and therefore let his Power be never so great and glorious, his receiving it from God, as the Reward of his Obedience , secures the Prerogative and Glory of the Father.

4. Especially when we add, That the Exercise and Administration of this Kingdom, is not by way of any direct

direct Authority and Power over God (which would necessarily Eclipse the glory of the Father, and make him subject to the Son) but by way of Mediation and Intercession, as an Advocate and High-Priest: He first makes Atonement to God, and reconciles him to Sinners, does not command or over-rule, but propitiate the Divine Justice, and then Exercises a Sovereign Authority in forgiving sins, in destroying his Enemies, in governing Kingdoms and Empires, in subserviency to his Spiritual Kingdom, and at the last Day in judging the World.

5. And therefore the time shall come, when Christ shall deliver up this Kingdom again to the Father: for it is not a Natural Kingdom, and therefore must not last always; no longer then till it has attained the ends for which it was erected; when Mankind are reduced into Obedience to God; when the Kingdom of the Devil is destroyed, and the Devil and his Angels, and all bad men cast into the Lake of Fire, which is the second Death, and good men raised out of their Graves, and rewarded with Eternal Life; that is, when Christ has accomplished the work of his Mediation, that there is no longer any need of a Mediator, then the Mediatory Kingdom ceases. *Then cometh the end, when he shall have delivered up the Kingdom to God even the Father, when he shall have put down all Rule, and all Authority and Power. — and when all things shall be subdued unto him, then shall the Son also be subject unto him, that put all things under him, that God may be all in all.* That is, the Son shall no longer have a distinct Kingdom of his own, but shall return to his Natural Subordination to his Father, and reign with Father and the Holy Spirit One

1 Cor. 15.

24....28.

One God blessed for evermore : there shall no longer be any distinction between God and a Mediator, but God shall be all in all.

This is the best Account I can give of that Kingdom which the Son receives from the Father, and which he delivers up to the Father again; and these *Socinians* must think themselves very great Wits, or the rest of Mankind very great Fools, who hope to prove that Christ is not God, because he received a Kingdom, when it is such a Kingdom, as none but a God can receive or administer. But to proceed :

3. His next Argument is, That Christ is not God, because *He is a Mediator between God and Men : a Priest that appeareth in the Presence of God, and intercedeth with him for men.* This he needed not have proved, because all Christians own it; only the *Socinians* make him a metaphorical Priest, which indeed is no Priest. But this I have answered already. He is a Priest after the Order of *Melchizedec* King of *Salem* and Priest of God; that is, he is a Sacerdotal King, and this Sacerdotal or Mediatory Kingdom proves him to be God, not a meer Creature Advocate or Intercessor.

4. His next Argument is, That he receives Authority from God, is sent by God, came to do the will of God : And this I have also already answered.

Page 8.

5. His next Argument consists in applying such things to the Divinity of our Saviour, as belong to his Humanity : That *he increased in Wisdom*—— (he should have added *Stature* too, but that had been ridiculous, because it had discovered the fallacy, for

2 Luke 52.

to

to be sure *Stature* does not belong to a God) and in favour with God and Men: and, why did he not add, that he was born, and was an Infant and Child, and by degrees grew up to be a Man? *that he knows not* ^{13 Mark 32.} the Day of Judgment, which he evidently speaks of himself as Man; as all the ancient Fathers confess. In St. Mark it is said, *But of that day, and that hour, knoweth no man, no not the Angels that are in Heaven, neither the Son, but the Father.* St. Matthew does ^{34 Matth. 36.} not mention the Son: *Of that day and hour knoweth no man, not the Angels of Heaven, but my Father only.* Which shews that the Son in St. Matthew is included in the *ēdek* none, or no man, and therefore concerns him only as a man: for the Father includes the whole Trinity, and therefore includes the Son, who seeth, whatever his Father doth. But of this more hereafter. That he knew not where *Lazarus* was laid, because he asks, *Where have ye laid him?* And yet this ^{11 John 34.} very Jesus knew without asking, at a distance, and some days before, that *Lazarus* was dead; which would tempt one to guess, that he might know where they laid him too, though it was decent to ask. What his next Text refers to I know not. For how the Father, being always present with him to confirm that testimony he gave of himself by miraculous Pow- ^{8 John 16, 18.} ers, proves that he is not God, I cannot tell: that he was tempted by the Devil, proves that he was a Man, but does not prove that he was not God: and that he would not be called *good* by those, who thought him ^{18 Luke 19.} no more than a man; or that he took this occasion to instruct them, what an infinite distance there is between the essential Goodness of the Divine Nature, and the Goodness of Creatures, I think does not prove that he is not God.

A Vindication of the Doctrine of the

6. His sixth Argument is to the same purpose; That God giveth what and to whom he pleaseth; he needs not the aid of any other; he entreateth not for himself and his people; he cannot die; and deriveth his Power from none but himself. But 'tis certain that the Lord Christ could not himself, without the previous ordination of the Father, confer the prime Dignities of Heaven or of the Church (or any thing else, if he pleases, for he does nothing but what he sees his Father do) he placed his safety in his Fathers presence and help: he prayed often and fervently to the Father, both for himself, and for his Disciples. He died, and was raised from the dead by the Father. After his Resurrection he had received of another that great Power, which he now enjoyeth.

Now all this we grant, and have answered already, which partly refers to the œconomy of the Incarnation, and partly to his Natural Subordination to his Father. But to give a more full and plain Answer, and to prevent all such Objections for the future, it will be necessary briefly to state this Matter also.

Now this Author is certainly so far in the right, that the One Supreme God has all Authority and Power, can need no help from any other, can receive no Commands, no Power from another, has no need to pray to any other, to intercede for himself or others, can dispose of all things, as he pleases, and to whom he pleases: accordingly this One Supreme God, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, receives no Power or Authority from any other Being, intercedes with no other Being, stands not in need of the help of any other, neither prays for himself or others to any other Being.

Well!

Well ! but the Son prays to the Father, interceeds with the Father, receives Authority from the Father, disposes of all things by his Father's Will. What then ? then the Son is not the One Supreme God. Why so ? He interceeds with no Creature, receives Authority from no Creature, &c. nor from any God neither separated from himself, for he is One God with the Father and the Holy Ghost : that he interceeds with the Father, proves indeed, that he is a distinct Person from the Father, not that he is not One God with him. If each Divine Person be God, none of them can interceed with, or receive Authority from any separate Being, for then there must be some separate God above them ; and then they are not the Supreme God ; but if there be Three distinct Divine Persons in the Godhead, and an order and subordination between these Divine Persons ; I see nothing to hinder, why One Person may not interceed with another, and receive from another.

To show the fallacy of this, I will frame another Argument exactly like it, which may do our *Socinians* a kindness in helping them to a new Argument, and who knows but that such great Wits as they are, may make it a good one : and it is this. The One Supreme God is not, and cannot be begotten of any other, nor proceed from any other, and therefore the Son, who is begotten of the Father, is not the One Supreme God, and the Holy Ghost, who proceeds from Father and Son, is not the One Supreme God. The Major is as self-evident as any Proposition in *Euclide* ; whoever understands the Terms, must confess it to be true, that the One Supreme God cannot be begotten, nor proceed from any other ; the Minor is confessed by *Trinitarians*, that the Son is begotten of

the Father, and the Holy Ghost proceeds from Father and Son; how then shall we avoid the Conclusion, That the Son is not the One Supreme God, nor the Holy Ghost the One Supreme God? Indeed no way, that I know of, for the thing is true: the Son is not the One Supreme God, nor the Holy Ghost the One Supreme God, nay nor the Father the One Supreme God, considered separately from each other, but Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, or a Trinity in Unity is the One Supreme God: Now of this One Supreme God, it is certainly true, that he is not begotten, nor proceeds from any other; for then there must be a God above this One Supreme God: but if there be Three Persons in this One Supreme God, this does not hinder, but the Father may beget the Son, and the Holy Spirit proceed from Father and Son, and yet the One Supreme God neither be begotten nor proceed; for it is not the One Supreme God, that is begotten, but the Divine Person of the Son, who is God, and with the Father and Holy Spirit, One Supreme God; nor is it the One Supreme God that proceeds, but the Divine Person of the Holy Ghost, who also is God, and together with Father and Son One Supreme God.

This is plain, and what every one may understand at first sight; and the fallacy of the Argument consists in this, That whatever may be affirmed of the One Supreme God, is applied to each Divine Person in their Personal Capacities, as if each Person considered separate from the other Divine Persons, were the One Supreme God: Now this is false, for the One Supreme God is not any One Person distinct and separate from the rest, but all Three Persons essentially united into One God; and therefore the Application must be false too; when what is true of the

One

Holy and Ever Blessed TRINITY.

181

One Supreme God, is applied to every distinct Person in the Godhead.

It is certain, the One Supreme God can neither be Father, Son, nor Holy Ghost: If he be a Father, he must beget a Son, who is not One with him, and yet is God: For the Son of God, who is begotten of his Father's Substance, and has the same Nature with him (which is the proper Notion of a begotten Son) must be God; as the Son of a man is a man: And if the Father himself in his own proper Person, as begetting the Son, be the One Supreme God, the whole entire Deity, then he must beget a Son without, not within himself, who is not, and cannot be that One Supreme God, that the Father is. The One Supreme God is One in himself, and separate from all other Beings: And therefore if the One Supreme God be a Father, he must beget a Son separate from himself; if he be a Son, he must have a Father separate from himself; and so of the Holy Ghost.

In the One Supreme God, there may and must be a Trinity of Divine Persons; within the Unity of the Godhead there is a Father, a Son, and a Holy Ghost, but the One Supreme God is neither; neither begets, nor is begotten, nor proceeds; for all Three Persons are the One Supreme God, and what belongs to the Godhead, belongs to them all as considered in the Unity of the same Godhead, but not as considered in their distinct Personal Capacities, as One is the Father, the other the Son, and the third the Holy Spirit.

And thus it is in the present Case: the One Supreme God can no more be sent, than he can be begotten, can receive no Commands from any other, cannot be given by any other, cannot be subject to

any

any other Will but his own, &c. but the Divine Persons may send and be sent, and interceed with each other; for though in the Unity of the Godhead they are all the One Supreme God, yet there is a mutual Relation and Subordination between the Divine Persons, as I have already explained it.

As to instance in Intercession or Prayer for himself or others, which is a Contradiction to the Notion of a Supreme God, as it is to the Notion of an Absolute and Sovereign Prince: But yet a Sovereign Prince may interceed with himself; his own Wisdom, his own Mercy, Clemency, and Compassion, may interceed with him, and prevail too, without any diminution to his own Sovereign Power. Thus though the Supreme God can interceed with no other Being, yet the Son may interceed with the Father; his own eternal and begotten Wisdom may interceed with him, and make Atonement and Expiation for sinners: and thus God interceeds with no body but himself; for it is his own Wisdom which interceeds with him, and makes the Atonement.

And if we will consider things aright, we shall find that there can be no other Advocate with the Father but the Son, but his own eternal and begotten Wisdom. When a man interceeds with himself, it is done by reflecting on his own Mind, and examining the Reasons and Motives he finds there to pity and spare, and to do good; that is, by his reflex Wisdom and Knowledge of himself, which in the Godhead is the Son, God's reflex Knowledge of himself, or his begotten Wisdom, that Divine *Ayē* or Word, which *Philo* calls the *deyxedēs* or High Priest: For let us consider, what it is to interceed with God, and what kind of Intercession is consistent both with the Sovereign

raign Authority, and Sovereign Goodness of God. An infinitely wise and just and good Being cannot be moved by meer Entreaties, nor by the bare Interest and Favour of the Advocate, for this is weakness in men, and therefore cannot be incident to the Divine Nature: Now if you set aside Entreaties and Importunities and Favour, there can be no other Advocate with the Father, but his own Eternal Wisdom. It is his own Wisdom that must Atonie him, that must reconcile him to sinners, that must obtain Pardon and all other Blessings for them; for if this cannot be done wisely, God cannot do it; and therefore his own Wisdom must do all this; for no created Wisdom can. But God loves his own Wisdom, his only begotten Son, and therefore Wisdom is a powerful Advocate, and must prevail with the Father. So that the Son's Intercession with the Father is so far from being incongruous, or inconsistent with his being God, that the Divine Nature can admit of no other Advocate or Intercessor, properly so called. To intercede with a never-failing Effect and Success, is an Act of Power and Authority, and for God to make a Creature-Advocate and Mediator, is to give a Creature Authority over himself, which cannot be; for it is a debasement of the Divine Nature, and a reproach to the Divine Wisdom, as if God did not better know, how to dispose of his Grace and Mercy, than any Creature does. For Creatures to pray to God for themselves or others, as humble Suppliants, is part of the Worship which Creatures owe to God; but to intercede with the Authority of a Mediator, is above the Nature and Order of Creatures; and God can no more give this to any Creature, than he can commit his own Sovereign Power and Authority.

rity to them : But his own Eternal Wisdom can intercede with Authority ; for Original Mind and Wisdom must yield to the Intercessions of his own Eternal Wisdom : which is not to submit to any Foreign Authority, but to his own. To proceed ;

7. His next Argument to prove that Christ is not God, is this ; That *Jesus Christ is in Holy Scripture always spoken of, as a distinct and different Person from God ; and described to be the Son of God, and the Image of God.* This we own, and he has no need to prove it : and this is a wonderful Argument to convince those who acknowledge Three distinct Persons in the Godhead, to prove that Christ is not God, because he is a distinct Person from the Father ; for so according to the Language of Scripture, *God signifies God the Father*, when he is distinguished from the Son and the Holy Spirit, as all men grant : and to say, *'Tis as impossible that the Son or Image of the One true God should himself be that One true God ; as that the Son should be the Father, and the Image that very thing whose Image it is, is meer Sophistry ;* for if the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost be the One true God, they are the same One true God, and yet the Father is not the Son, nor the Son the Father.

Page 12.

Page 13.

8. His next Argument is, from *many Texts, which expressly declare that only the Father is God.* Now this I confess, would be a demonstration, could he produce any one Text, which asserts the Father only to be God, in opposition to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost ; for then the Father must signify the Person of the Father, in opposition to the Person of the Son, and to the Person of the Holy Ghost ; but when the
Father

Father is called the Only true God, only in opposition to all the false Gods, which the world then worshipped, there *Father* does not signifie personally, but that One Godhead or Divinity, of which the Father is the Source and Fountain and Original; he being that Eternal and Original Mind, which begets his own Image or Eternal Son, and from whom and the Son the Holy Spirit proceeds in the Unity of the same Godhead.

When the Father is said to be the *only true God*, and the *One God*, that the Son and Holy Ghost are not hereby excluded from the Unity of the same Godhead, is evident from those other Texts of Scripture, which plainly teach the Divinity of the Son and Holy Ghost; for if the Scripture teaches, that the Son is God, and the Holy Ghost God, it can never separate the Father from his only begotten Son and Eternal Spirit; and therefore the Dispute will issue here, Whether the Scripture does teach the Divinity of the Son and the Holy Spirit.

17 John 3.
1 Cor. 8. 6.

When the Father is called the only true God, it must be in opposition to all those who were at that time worshipped for Gods in the World, but were not true Gods, and therefore when Christ calls his Father the *only true God*, it could not be in contradiction to himself and the Holy Spirit, for they were not then distinctly worshipped. And when St. Paul calls the Father the *One God*, he expressly opposes it to the many Gods of the Heathens. *For though there be that are called Gods, whether in Heaven (the Sun and Moon and Planets, and Deified men) or in the Earth (the several Elements, Birds, Beasts, &c.) (as there be Gods many and Lords many) but to us, there is but one God the Father, of whom are all things,*

and we in him ; and One Lord Jesus Christ , by whom are all things , and we by him ; where the One God and One Lord and Mediator is opposed to the many Gods and many Lords or Mediators , which were worshipped by the Heathens.

These Texts indeed do plainly distinguish between the Father, and Christ : *This is Life eternal to know thee the only true God , and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent . . And to us there is but One God the Father , and One Lord Jesus Christ ;* which is no more than what St. Paul teaches ; *There is one God , and One Mediator between God and Men , the Man Christ Jesus.* The One God and the One Mediator ought to be distinguished ; for the whole Christian Religion, and the salvation of sinners, depends upon this distinction ; but this does not exclude Christ from being One God with the Father, though he have a distinct additional Glory of a Mediatory Kingdom.

I consider farther, when the Father is called the *One God , and the only true God* , it can be understood only of those, who are distinct and separated Gods from the Father, and are not One God with him ; but it cannot exclude those, who are united in the Unity of the same Godhead ; for they are but *One God* with the Father.

And this is plainly signified in the Title of the Father, and the Father of our Lord Jesus, which is God's peculiar Name under the Gospel, as the Maker of Heaven and Earth was before : for the Title of the Father does not exclude, but includes the Son ; and therefore if it appears from Scripture , that this Son is true and real God, begotten of his Father from Eternity, the Son at least must be included in this Character of *the only true God.* His other Texts , which

Holy and Ever Blessed TRINITY.

187

which he cites under this Head, prove no more but that the Father of Christ is God, not that Christ is not One God with the Father. 1 Cor. 15. 24.
3 James 9.
15 Rom. 6.

9. He adds; *If Christ were indeed God, as well as* Page 14.
Man, or (as Trinitarians speak) God the Son incarnate
in an Human Nature, it had been altogether superfluous
to give the Holy Spirit to his said Human Nature
as a Director and Guide; for what other help could
that Nature need, which was One Person with (as they
speak) God the Son, and in which God the Son did personally dwell.

Now the account of this is plain and short; for the whole Trinity is but One Energy and Power, and the Divine Persons cannot act separately *ad extra*; what the Father does, that the Son does, and that the Holy Ghost does by one individual Act, as I have shown at large; but the sanctification of all Creatures (and such the Human Nature of Christ is) is peculiarly attributed to the Holy Spirit; and he might as well have asked, Why the sanctification of the Church is ascribed to the Holy Spirit; for the Church is the Body of Christ, and Christ the Head from whence all Influences of Grace are derived into the Body; and though this be not a personal Union, it is next degree to it; for *we are Flesh of his Flesh, and Bone of his Bone*: and a Personal Union makes no difference in the manner of Operation, though it does in the Measures and Degrees: the Divine Word acts by and in conjunction with the Holy Spirit, and therefore sanctifies his own Human Nature, as he does his mystical Body the Church by the Operations and Influences of the Holy Ghost.

10. And this Answers his next Argument, That the Miracles of Christ are attributed to the Holy Ghost, or to the Father dwelling in him : for Father, Son, and Holy Ghost act together, as Christ tells us, *My Father worketh hitherto, and I work.*

Page 15.

11. His next Argument is ; *Had our Lord been more than a Man, the Prophecies of the Old Testament in which he is promised, would not describe him barely as the Seed of the Woman ; the Seed of Abraham ; a Prophet like unto Moses, the Servant and Missionary of God, on whom God's Spirit should rest.* That our Saviour ought to have been thus described, though he had been more than a Man, is plain enough, because he was to be all this : *the Seed of the Woman, the Seed of Abraham, a Prophet like unto Moses*, but a much greater Prophet : for *Moses was faithful in all his House as a Servant, but Christ as a Son over his own House.* But what he insinuates, that he is *barely* thus described, shews, That this Author will never loose a Cause by over-much Modesty ; for we with all the Christian Church, and we have the Authority of Christ and his Apostles for it too, say, That he is described in the Old Testament also, not only as the Seed of *Abraham*, but as the Son of God. Of which more presently.

3. Hebr. 5, 6.

His next Attempt is against the Divinity of the Holy Ghost, but here is little that requires a distinct Answer, it being only the Repetition of his old Fallacies.

Page 16.

1. That *the Holy Ghost or Spirit, and the Power of God, are spoken of as one and the same thing.* And what then ? His intended Conclusion, I suppose, is that

that the Holy Ghost is not a Person, which is the Intention of his second Argument; but this is so novel and ridiculous a Conceit, (too senseless for any of the ancient Hereticks) that it ought not to be seriously confuted, but despised: for it is as easie to prove the Father and the Son to be no Persons, as the Holy Spirit. He is the Spirit of God, which searcheth the deep things of God, and he who knows all that is in God, is a knowing Mind: but to dream of Power and Inspiration in God, distinct as he confesses from God, and no Person; is to attribute such Powers and Faculties to an infinite Mind, as there are in created Minds; to compound God of Mind and Intellectual Powers and Faculties, which all Men of sense have scorned the thoughts of: what are Faculties in us, are Persons in God, or else God is not a pure and simple Act, as I showed above. Which shows the vanity of his Pretence, *That the Holy Spirit is spoken of as a Person, by the same figure of Speech that Charity is described as a Person, 1 Cor. 13. 4, 5. and Wisdom, 9 Prov. 11.* For these natural or acquired Powers and Habits are said to do that which the Person who has them, and acts by them, does: as *Charity suffereth long, and is kind*, because a charitable man does so, &c. And if we will allow such Habits and Powers in God, the Case may be somewhat parallel; for when we have compounded God of Substance or Essence, or Faculties or Powers, we may then find figurative Persons in God, as there are in Men.

This is certain, all Personal Acts belong to a Person, and therefore whatever has any Personal Acts ascribed to it, we must conclude is a Person, unless we know by some other means, that it is no Person; and then that proves the Expression to be figurative.

Thus

Thus we know Charity is no Person, but a Grace or Vertue, and therefore when Personal Acts are attributed to Charity, as to suffer long, and be kind, &c. we know this is a figure; but it is ridiculous hence to conclude, That the Holy Ghost, who has Personal Acts ascribed to him, to work Miracles, to raise the Dead, to comfort, to convince, to sanctifie the Church, to dwell in the Church, as in his Temple, &c. is yet no Person, because Charity, which we know to be no Person, has Personal Acts ascribed to it: which is as much as to say, That because Personal Acts are sometimes used figuratively, therefore they must never be properly expounded; whereas on the other hand, we must never expound any thing figuratively, but where the subject will not admit of a proper sense. If it were as known and certain, that the Holy Ghost is no Person, as that Charity is none, then there would be reason to allow a figure; but to prove that the Holy Ghost is no Person, only because Personal Acts are sometimes figuratively attributed to that which is no Person, is a maxim only in the *Socinian* Logick, which is nothing else but a System of absurd and ridiculous Fallacies.

2. His second Argument against the Spirit's being God, is this; *A manifest distinction is made, as between God and Christ, so also between God and the Holy Spirit, or Power and Inspiration of God; so that 'tis impossible the Spirit should be God himself.* This has been answered already, as to the distinction between God and Christ, and the same Answer will serve for the Holy Spirit. But this Confession of the *Socinian* confutes his whole Hypothesis, and proves the Holy Spirit to be a Person, and a God.

He says the Holy Spirit is distinct from God, so distinct that 'tis impossible he should be God himself; then say I, this Holy Spirit is either a Divine subsisting Person, or nothing but a Name. If this Spirit were a Divine Vertue and Power, as he would have it, then it is not distinct from God, but is God himself, as the Powers and Faculties of the Mind, though they may be distinguished from each other, yet they can't be any thing distinct from the Mind, but are the Mind it self; and therefore if the Spirit, as he says, be represented in Scripture, as so distinct from God, that 'tis impossible he should be God himself, then he must be a distinct Divine Person, and not the meer Power of God, which is not distinct from God himself.

If the Spirit be distinct from God, and not God himself, and yet have Personal Acts ascribed to him, then he must be a distinct Person; for Faculties, Vertues, and Powers, have Personal Acts and Offices ascribed to them, only upon account of their unity and sameness with the Mind in which they are, which is a Person, and acts by these Powers; but a Power which is distinct from God, and is not God himself, (as he says the Holy Spirit is) if it have any Personal Acts, must be a distinct Person; and if these Personal Acts are such, as are proper only to God, it must be a distinct Divine Person.

He says, this Holy Spirit is the Inspiration of God; be it for This Inspiration then is either within God himself, or without him, in Creatures, who have this Inspiration. If it be within God himself, it must be a Person, or else it cannot be distinct from God; and a Divine Person unless any thing be in God, which is not God. If this Inspiration be without God, in Creatures,

1 Cor. 2. 10, 11.

tures, who are inspired by him; how is it the Spirit of God? for the Spirit of God must be in God, as the Spirit of Man is in Man: How does this Inspiration in Creatures *search all things, yea the deep things of God? and knoweth the things of God, as the Spirit of a Man knoweth the things of a man?* For the inspiration in Creatures searcheth nothing of God, and knoweth nothing of God, but what God is pleased to reveal. The Inspiration knows nothing of God, but the inspired Mind knows as much, as it is inspired with the knowledge of. So that according to this Account, the Spirit of God is nothing but the inspired knowledge in Creatures; and therefore no Personal Acts can be attributed to it, but what Creatures can do by such Inspiration; and let any man consider, whether this Answers those Characters we have of the Spirit of God in Scripture.

1 Cor. 12. 4, 5, 6.

If this be so, I desire to know, How the Spirit of God differs from his Gifts and Graces? For if the Spirit be nothing but God's Inspiration in Creatures, the Spirit is either a Gift or a Grace, and is not One in All, but as many as those Creatures are, that are inspired; and as different as the Gifts and Graces are, with which they are Inspired: Whereas St. Paul tells us, *There are Diversities of Gifts, but the same Spirit; and there are differences of Administrations, but the same Lord, and there are diversities of Operations, but it is the same God, which worketh all in all.* So that the Spirit is distinguished from his Gifts, as the Lord is from his Administrations, and God from his Operations; and is the same Spirit in all, as it is the same Lord, and the same God.

3. His

3. His next Argument is, *The Spirit is obtained for us of God by our Prayers; therefore itself is not God.* But this has been answered already; for though the One Supreme God cannot be sent, nor given (which I suppose is the force of his Argument) yet in the ever blessed Trinity, One Divine Person may send and give another; the Father may send the Son, and give the Holy Spirit. And yet since they like that better, we will allow, *That the Holy Spirit does give himself, and is asked of himself;* for the Divine Persons in the Trinity, as I have often observed and proved, do not act separately, but as the Father and the Son give the Holy Spirit, so the Holy Spirit gives himself in the same individual Act.

And when we pray to God for his Holy Spirit, we pray to Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, who are this One God, and One entire object of Worship: It is the ever blessed Trinity we invoke, when we pray *Our Father, which art in Heaven.* For as they are inseparably One God, so they are the inseparable Object of our Worship; since this great Mystery of a Trinity in Unity is so plainly revealed to us, we cannot worship this One Supreme God, but we must direct our Worship to all Three Divine Persons in the Unity of the same Godhead; for we do not worship this One Supreme God, unless we worship, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost: and therefore whether we invoke each Person distinctly, as our Church does in the beginning of the Litany; or pray only to God by the Name of the most High God, or by the Name of Father; or the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, it is all one, for Father, Son, and Holy Ghost is the One Supreme God, and the entire Object of our Worship: and whoever worships One God, but not Father, Son,

and Holy Ghost, does not worship the true God, not the God of the Christians. Before this was so plainly revealed, it was sufficient to worship One Supreme God, without any conception of the distinct Persons in the Godhead; but when it is plainly revealed to us, that this One Supreme God is Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, whoever does not worship Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, does not worship the true God; for the true God is Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and there is no God besides him: which I would desire our *Unitarians* (as they falsely call themselves) and our *Deists* carefully to consider: if any thing be fundamental in Religion, it is the worship of the One true God, and if Father, Son, and Holy Ghost be this One true God, those who worship a God, who is not Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, do not worship the true God, and that I think is the true Notion of Idolatry. So that these Men are so far from being Christians, that I cannot see, how they are worshippers of the true God: which should at least make them concerned to examine this matter with more Care and less Prejudice than they have yet done.

So that when we worship One God, we worship Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and when the Glory of these Divine Persons was made known to the World, there was no need of any new Command to worship these three Divine Persons; for when it is revealed, that they are the One Eternal God, the Command of worshipping this One God must include them all. Which gives a sufficient Answer to what he adds, That *there is neither Precept nor Example in all Holy Scripture, of Prayer made to the Spirit, on this or any other occasion: which on the Trinitarian Supposition, that the Holy Spirit is a Person and God, no less than*
the

the Father, is very surprizing, nay utterly unaccountable. But I hope this will satisfy any man, that it is not unaccountable; for though the Spirit be God, he is but One God, with Father and Son, and therefore not a distinct and separate Object of Worship, but is worshipped with the Father and the Son, in the Unity of the same Godhead, and this required no new Command, nor any separate worship of the Holy Spirit.

There is indeed a distinct worship paid to Christ: *All men must honour the Son, as they honour the Father. When God brought his first-begotten into the World, that is, when he raised him from the Dead, and exalted him to his own right hand, he said, and let all the Angels of God worship him: God hath highly exalted him, and given him a Name, which is above every Name, that at the Name of Jesus every Knee should bow, of things in Heaven, and things in Earth, and things under the Earth.* But this is not merely as he is the Son of God, the second Person in the Trinity, for so he is worshipped as One God with the Father and the Holy Ghost; but as he is a Mediator or a Mediatory King; as he has a Kingdom distinct from the Natural Kingdom of the Father, as I have already shown, so there is a worship proper to him as Mediator; but the Holy Spirit has no distinct Kingdom, and therefore no distinct Worship, but is worshipped in the Unity of the Godhead, and this required no new Command; for he who knows, that Father, Son, and Holy Ghost are One Supreme God, must worship Father, Son, and Holy Ghost as One Supreme God.

¹ Hebr. 6.

² Phil. 10, 11.

4. His next Argument is against a Trinity of Persons

Page 19.

sons in the Godhead, which, he says, is *contrary to the whole Scripture, which speaks of God but as One Person, and speaks of him, and to him, by singular Pronouns, such as I, Thou, Me, Him.*

13 Job 7, 8.

His Proofs that the Scripture speaks of God as *but One Person*, are very wonderful. His first is, that of *Job*; *Will ye speak wickedly for God? and talk deceitfully for him? Will ye accept his Person? will ye contend for God?* But surely to accept God's *Person*, no more signifies the Personality of the Godhead, than to accept the Person of a Man, signifies his Human Person: the Hebrew is *his Face*, which is far from signifying a Person in the sense we say, there are Three Persons in the Godhead. To respect the Person of a Man is to do something for him, which neither Law, nor Justice, nor Equity required, not because he is a Person, which every Man is, but from some partial respect we have to his particular Person; and therefore to accept *the Person of God* here signifies to *speak wickedly for God*; which is an absurd and senseless thing, as *Job* represents it, whether the Supreme God be One Person, or Three; for in this sense of Person, One God can be but One Person.

Hebr. 1, 2.

The other Text that Christ is the express Image of God's Person, is as little to the purpose; for it is plain, the Person of whom the Son is the express Image, is the Person of God the Father; and the Father indeed is but One Person.

As for his singular Pronouns, they prove indeed that there is but One God, as we all own, not that there are not Three Persons in the Godhead. For when the Scripture speaks of God without any particular respect to the distinction of the Persons, it must speak but of One God, because God is but One, and singular

singular Pronouns are most properly applied to One God. As for what he objects, That *no Instance can be given in any Language of Three Persons whoever spoke of themselves, or were spoken to, by the singular Pronouns, I, Thou, Me, Him, Thee;* it were sufficient to answer, That there is no other Example in Nature neither, of Three Persons who are essentially One; and if the manner of speaking must be conformed to the Nature of Things, there can be no other Instance of this way of speaking, because there is no other Example of this Unity; but all Languages speak of One in the singular Number, and to the Scripture uses singular Pronouns of One God. But this is not the Case; for when God speaks of himself, he does not speak of himself, as Three Persons, but as One God, and therefore may say *I* and *Me*: and when the Prophets speak of God, or pray to him, they pray to him as One God, and therefore may say, *Thou*, and *Him*, and *Thee*. When Three Persons are One God, God may speak of himself, or we may speak of, or to God, either considered as Three Persons, or as One God; and though Three Persons require the Plural Number, yet One God may speak of himself, or be spoken to, by singular Pronouns.

5. He says, *Had the Son or Holy Ghost been God,* Page 221
this would not have been omitted in the Apostles Creed.
 And I say, Had not the Son been God, and the Holy Ghost God, they would not have been put into the Apostles Creed, no more than into the form of Baptism, which is the original of the Apostles Creed. That the Primitive Christians did believe the Divinity of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, we are sufficiently assured from all the ancient Records of their Faith; but there was no reason to express this in so short a Creed, before the *Arian*
and

and *Socinian* Heresies had disturbed the Church; and indeed there was no need of it, for the only Son of God must be by Nature God, and the Spirit of God is as essentially God, as the Spirit of a Man is essential to a Man.

Page 24.

He concludes; That *theirs* (the *Socinians*) is an accountable and reasonable Faith; but that of the *Trinitarians* is absurd, and contrary both to Reason and to it self, and therefore not only false, but impossible. The Faith of a Trinity in Unity, I hope, I have sufficiently vindicated already from Absurdity and Contradiction. But it will be worth the while briefly to consider, how accountable and reasonable the *Socinian* Faith is.

The *Socinian* Doctrine is, That Christ, who is called the Son, the only begotten Son of God, the Brightness of his Glory, and the express Image of his Person, is no more than a meer Man, who had no Being, till he was Conceived in the Womb of the Virgin Mary, and is called the Son of God, because God formed him by an immediate Power in the Virgins Womb, and raised him from the Dead, and exalted him to his own right hand in Heaven; and that the Holy Spirit is only the Power and Inspiration of God, that is, is either God himself, or the Operation of his Power in Creatures.

This is their accountable and reasonable Doctrine, and to show how very accountable and reasonable it is, I come now to draw up my charge against it.

1. That it ridicules the Scriptures. 2. That it ridicules the whole Jewish œconomy. 3. That it ridicules the Christian Religion. 4. That it justifies, or at least excuses both Pagan and Popish Idolatries.

The

The Charge is full enough, and I am contented it should pass only for big husling words, till I have proved it; and then I hope, it may pass for a just Return to the ridiculous Blasphemies of the *Brief Notes*, and *Brief History*.

1. That it ridicules the Scripture, by putting either an absurd, or a very mean trifling sense on it, unworthy of the Wisdom of God, by whom it was inspired; and this I shall give some Instances of, in their Expositions of Scripture, which I find in the *Brief History* of the *Unitarians*.

In the second Letter he takes notice of some Texts in the Old Testament, which speak of God, and in the New Testament are applied to Christ, which we think a very good Argument to prove, That Christ is that God, to whom those Texts belong in the Old Testament; for though possibly without such an Application we could not certainly have known, that these Texts were spoken of Christ, yet the Authority of Christ and his Apostles who have made this Application, is as good a Reason to believe, that they were meant of Christ, as to believe any other part of the Gospel: Let us then consider, how he answers such Texts.

What the Psalmist says, *Thy Throne, O God, is for ever and ever, a Scepter of Righteousness is the Scepter of thy Kingdom. Thou hast loved Righteousness, and hated Iniquity, therefore God, even thy God hath anointed Thee with the Oyl of Gladness above thy Fellows*; the Apostle to the *Hebrews* applies to Christ; *But unto the Son he saith, thy Throne, O God, &c.* To this he Answers, *In the Hebrew, and in the Greek, tis God is thy Throne* (i. e. thy seat, resting place, establishment)

Page 4. 5.
45 Psalm 6. 7.
1 Hebr. 8. 9.

blissment) for ever; If he had only said, *it may be so*, he had said right; but it is false, to say, *it is so*. For the Hebrew *Elohim* may be either the Nominative or the Vocative Case, and so the Greek $\delta \Theta\epsilon\delta\varsigma$, which is an Attick Vocative, and so is used by the *Septuagint*, 22 Psalm 1. $\text{O } \Theta\epsilon\delta\varsigma \mu\epsilon\delta, \delta \Theta\epsilon\delta\varsigma \mu\epsilon\delta$, *My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me*. And it is evident, the *Septuagint*, the *Vulgar Latine*, the *Chaldee Paraphrase*, the *Syriack* and *Arabick Versions*, took it for the Vocative Case, and thus the Christian Church has always understood it; and this is the most natural Construction, when it immediately follows a Pronoun, which has no other immediate Relative; *Thy Throne, O God*, that is, *O God, thy Throne is for ever and ever*. And thus the Apostle must understand it; *To the Son he saith, Thy Throne, O God*; where, *O God*, must be referred to the *Son*, and *thy to God*: and the sense he gives of it, is absurd, and what we have no Example of in Scripture, that *God is a Throne*: God indeed is called a *Rock*, a *Fortress*, a *high Tower*, which is expounded by a *Deliverer*; but a *Throne* here signifies a *Kingdom*, as is evident from the following words; and to say, that God is *the Throne*, and *the Kingdom* of Christ, is to Subject the Father to the Son; for a King sits upon his Throne, and governs his Kingdom.

108 Psalm 2.

102 Psalm 25,
25, 27.

The Apostle in the next Verse cites another glorious Testimony which God hath given to his Son; *And, Thou Lord in the beginning hast laid the Foundations of the Earth, and the Heavens are the work of thine hands; they shall perish, but thou remainest; and they all shall wax old as doth a Garment, and as a Vesture shalt thou fold them up, and they shall be changed; but thou art the same, and thy years shall not fail*. This

is

is so plain a Testimony to the Divinity of our Saviour, if these words be allowed to be applied by the Apostle to Christ, that our Author is forced to deny it. He says, *The Context has this sense, And thou Lord, (that is, and in another Text of the Psalms, it is said, Thou Lord)* which is certainly true, if he had added but One word more, *viz. to the Son. And in another Text of the Psalms, it is said to the Son, And thou Lord hast laid the Foundations of the Earth;* for so the Context requires us to supply it, if we will make sense of it; for the Apostle observes in what different Language God speaks of the Angels, and to the Son: *Of the Angels he saith, who maketh his Angels Spirits, and his Ministers a flaming fire; but to the Son, he saith, thy Throne, O God, is for ever and ever.----- And to the Son he saith, Thou Lord in the beginning hast laid the Foundations of the Earth.----- But to which of the Angels said he at any time, Sit on my right hand until I make thine Enemies thy Footstool.* This is easie and natural; but to apply those words to the Father, *Thou Lord in the beginning hast laid the Foundations of the Earth, &c.* is to break the whole Context, is contrary to the Apostles design, and no good sense can be made of it; and this I think is to ridicule Scripture, to make it Nonsense, or very bad, disturbed, and incoherent sense, when there is no need of it, but to serve an Hypothesis which the Text was designed to confute. He says, *Tho. Aquinas rightly acknowledged, that the words of both these Texts may be understood of God only, not of Christ;* but this is false (as indeed he seldom cites any Author, but he corrupts him) for Thomas says, *this Text may be understood of either, but if you understand it of the Father, then by in the beginning you must understand the Son, who, he says,*

is called *the beginning*: *Thou Lord in the beginning*, that is, in or by the Son, *hast laid the Foundations of the Earth*; for he saw the Context required, that these words should be applied to Christ, but he thought it indifferent, whether they were applied to him in whole or in part, since both ways he is made the Creator of the World, which answers the Apostles design; and though I think *Thomas* was mistaken, yet this makes nothing to our Authors purpose.

68 Psalm 18.
4 Eph. 8.

Thus what the *Psalmist* says of God, *Thou hast ascended on high, thou hast led captivity captive, thou hast received Gifts for Men*; St. Paul attributes to Christ. Here our Historian spends a great many words to no purpose, about Christ's descent into the Grave and into Hell, and his ascending into Heaven to fill all things; or, as he says, it might be better rendred to fulfil all things, that is, all the Prophecies of himself, and others concerning his Death, and Ascension into the highest Heavens: But how does *in nobis* signify all Prophecies, or how does his Ascension into Heaven fulfil all Prophecies? As for the Gifts given to men, he says, in the Psalms, they are literally meant of God, and of Christ, only by way of Prophecy, or rather of Emblem, or Accommodation; which he learnedly proves, because the Gifts the Apostle speaks of, were not given or received till about One thousand years after David's time.

Now what of all this? we readily grant, that ascending on high, the leading captivity captive, the receiving gifts for men, which the *Psalmist* speaks of, were not the same, with the Ascension of Christ into Heaven, his leading captivity captive, and giving Gifts to men, but were Types and Figures of it; but the single Question is, Whether Christ be that God,
of

of whom the *Psalmist* says, that he ascended on high, &c. if he be not, St. Paul has abus'd us, for he applies that to Christ, which was not said of him; if he be, we have what we desire, that Christ is God: but this, which was the only Question, he says not one word to. Men may be Types and Figures, as *David* and others were of Christ; and in this case, what was said of *David*, as a Typical Person, may be applied to the Person of Christ: but God himself can be no Type, for the Type is always less perfect than the Antitype; and therefore whatever is said of God, must belong to his Person, and cannot belong to any other. What God did under the typical State of the Law, may be a Type and Figure of those more glorious things, which we would do in Human Nature; and thus his Triumphs and Victories over the Enemies of his Church, which is by a Metaphor called his ascending on high, (since God, who fills all places, neither locally ascends nor descends) was a Type and Figure of his real Ascension into Heaven, after he had first descended into the lowermost parts of the Earth, as the Apostle argues; but if what the *Psalmist* says, that God ascended on high, &c. received its accomplishment in the Ascension of Christ into Heaven, Christ must be the God of whom the *Psalmist* speaks.

Thus what the *Psalmist* says of God, *Worship him* Page 49.
all ye Gods, or Angels, the Apostle Attributes to 97 Psalm 7.
 Christ; *when he bringeth in the first begotten into the*
world, he saith, and let all the Angels of God worship
him. To this our Author answers, *In uncertain whe-*
ther St. Paul had any respect to the words in the Psalm.
 What? when he cites the very words, as a Prophecy
 of Christ? How shall we then know, when the Apo-

file has respect to the words he quotes? But if he had, he doth not quote the words of the Psalmist as if they were spoken of Christ, but only declareth the Decree of God (known to him by the Spirit) for subjecting the Angels to Christ, in the same words that the Psalmist had used upon another occasion. But he proves this Decree of God by no other Revelation, but the words of the Psalmist, nor pretends any other; and if that do not prove it, we have no other. But his Reason for this is admirable, because they are words most proper to express that Decree, for the Writers of the New Testament generally affect to speak in Scripture language: which is an effectual Answer to all the Texts of Scripture quoted out of the Old Testament; that the Apostles did not intend to prove any thing by them, but only affected to speak in Scripture language; but when the Apostle says this was spoken of Christ, if it were not spoken of him, I doubt he affected something worse than speaking in Scripture Language; this is either to ridicule Scripture, or give the lie to it, let him choose which he likes best.

Page 60.

45 Isai. 23.

14 Rom. 10,

11.

St. Paul applies that of the Prophet *Isaiah*, *I have sworn by my self*, (which all acknowledge to be spoken by God) *unto me every knee shall bow*, to Christ. This our Historian says, is, *Because Christ then and there (at the last Judgment) holdeth the place of God, representeth him, and acteth by his Commission. So men are said to appear before our Sovereign Lord the King, when they appear at the Bar of his Judges, because the Judges act in the King's stead, and by his Commission.* But why does he confine this bowing the Knee to the last Judgment? St. Paul indeed gives this as one Instance of it, but does not confine it to this, but in the Epistle

file to the *Philippians* makes it as large as the Exaltation of our Saviour; *Wherefore God hath highly exalted him, and given him a Name, which is above every Name, That at the Name of Jesus every knee should bow,----- and that every Tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the Glory of God the Father.* This is what God says by the Prophet, *Every Tongue shall swear to me;* and St. Paul to the *Romans*, *Every Tongue shall confess to God.* And this shows, that it is the Person of Christ to whom we must bow the knee: it is the Name of Jesus at which every knee must bow; and every Tongue must confess, that Jesus Christ is the Lord. Now I suppose he will not say, That we must confess the Judges to be the King, or that we must bow to their Persons, but to their Commission; or that they represent the King, wherever they are, but only in the King's Court.

If then we must bow to the Person of Christ, and confess him to be the Lord, and this be an accomplishment of God's Oath, unto me every Knee shall bow, and every Tongue shall swear; then Christ is that God, who in the Prophet *Isaiab* swore, that every Knee should bow to him: And the Prophet plainly describes, who this God is to whom every Knee shall bow; *Surely shall one say, in the Lord have I righteousness and strength; even to him shall men come, and all that are incensed against him shall be ashamed; in the Lord shall the Seed of Israel be justified, and shall glory;* And I suppose all Christians know, who that Lord is, who is made unto us *Wisdom, and Righteousness, Sanctification and Redemption; by whom we are justified through Faith in his Blood:* And this is that God, to whom every Knee must bow.

But

But he is a little mistaken also in his Law; we are not said to appear before our Sovereign Lord the King, because we appear before the Judges, who act by the King's Commission; for this is true only of the Court of *King's Bench*, which is peculiarly the King's Court; though other Judges act by the King's Commission also: in the Kings Court we are said to appear before the King.

But now though Christ receive his Kingdom and Power from God, and God is said to judge the World by him, yet it is properly *Christ's Judgment Seat*: So St. Paul here calls it; *We shall all stand before the Judgment-Seat of Christ*; and we must all appear before the Judgment-Seat of Christ; for the Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all Judgment to the Son, that all men should honour the Son even as they honour the Father; which I explained before. And therefore this being Christ's Court, of which he is the Supream and Sovereign Judge, to him we must bow our Knee; that is, he is that Lord, of whom the Prophet *Isaiah* speaks.

74 Rom. 10.
2 Cor. 5. 10.

8 *Isa.* 13; 14.

The same Prophet tells us, *Sanctify the Lord of Hosts himself, and let him be your fear, and let him be your dread. And he shall be for a Sanctuary; but for a Stone of stumbling, and for a Rock of Offence to both the Houses of Israel, for a gin, and for a snare to the Inhabitants of Jerusalem.* This is evidently spoken of the Lord of Hosts, the God of Israel. And this St. Paul applies to Christ, that the Jews did *stumble and fall, and were broken*, as the Prophet foretold at this *stumbling Stone*: Israel, which followed after the Law of Righteousness, hath not attained to the Law of Righteousness. Wherefore? because they sought it, not by Faith (the Faith of Christ) but as it were by the Works

9 Rom. 31,
32, 33.

Works of the Law, for they stumbled at the stumbling-stone; as it is written, Behold I lay in Sion a stumbling-stone, and rock of offence; and whosoever believeth on him shall not be ashamed. Where the Apostle joyns two Prophecies together; the first, that which I have already quoted, where the Lord of Hosts is said to be a Stumbling-stone, and Rock of Offence: And another of the same Prophet; *Behold, I lay in Zion for a Foundation a Stone, a tried Stone, a precious Corner-stone, a sure Foundation: he that believeth shall not make haste; which both St. Paul and St. Peter render with the Septuagint shall not be ashamed.* Now from hence we learn, that the Prophet speaks of the same Stone, that *the Stumbling-stone and Rock of Offence, is the Foundation-stone, the precious Corner-stone:* and therefore the Lord of Hosts, who is the Stumbling-stone, is the precious Corner-stone also: And St. Paul and St. Peter tells us, that Christ is the Stumbling-stone, and that precious Corner-stone, of which the Prophets speaks, that is, that Christ is *the Lord of Hosts.* To whom (to Christ) *coming as unto a living Stone, disallowed indeed of Men, but chosen of God and precious, ye also as lively Stones are built up a spiritual House—wherefore also it is contained in Scripture, Behold, I lay in Sion a chief Corner-stone, elect, precious, and he that believeth on him shall not be confounded, or ashamed.*

28 Isa. 16.

1 Pet. 2.4, 5, 6.

All that our Historian says to this, is, That neither St. Paul, nor St. Peter cite the words of the Prophet as spoken of Christ, but only as in some sense applicable to him, namely as Christ was to many a Stone of Stumbling; which is nothing else but to out-face the World with down-right Impudence; and to charge the Apostles with abusing Scripture, and producing Proofs, which

Page 56.

which are no Proofs. St. Paul alledges this Propheſie to prove, that the Infidelity of the Jews, and that Offence they ſhould take at Chriſt, was foretold in Scripture; which answers that Objection againſt his being the Meſſias, that the great Body of *Iſrael*, to whom the Meſſias was peculiarly promiſed, ſhould reject him when he came; which had it not been foretold, had been a very unanſwerable prejudice; and yet if Chriſt be not the Prophets *ſtumbling Stone*, this Propheſie does not foretel it. St. Peter urges this Propheſie to prove, that Chriſt is the Foundation, Corner Stone, Elect, and Precious, on which the Church was to be built; but he abuſes us alſo with a ſham Proof, if this Propheſie were not meant of Chriſt. And thus theſe men, rather than they will allow the Scripture proofs, that Chriſt is God, deſtroy all the Old Teſtament proofs of the Truth of Chriſtianity; and I am afraid they are able to give us no good proofs of Chriſtianity without them; and yet if ſuch Texts as theſe muſt paſs only for Accommodations and Alluſions, I know not where they will find any proofs. St. John curiouſly obſerves the ſeveral Circumſtances of our Saviour's Death, and ſhows that they were the Accompliſhment of ancient Propheſies; and among others, that of piercing his ſide with the Souldier's Spear, which was foretold by the Prophet *Zechary*, *They ſhall look on me, whom they have pierced*, which is confeſſed to be ſpoken of God; and here he tells us again, *That the words in the Prophet are not by St. John interpreted of Chriſt, but accommodated to Chriſt and his Sufferings*. And thus, as faſt as he can, one after another, he accommodates away all the proofs of Chriſtianity: for we may as well prove the Goſpel out of *Homer*, by accommodating *Homer's*

12 Zech. 10.

19 John 37.

Page 65.

Homer's Words and Phrases to it, and turning it into an *Homeric* Poem, as we know has been done, as prove it by accommodating the Phrases and Language of the Old Testament to it, which were never intended to signify any such thing; this I think is to ridicule and profane both the Old and New Testament, and to overthrow the Authority of both.

But I am quite tired with this Work, and therefore shall pass over his other Old Testament Proofs; for what can we say to convince these men, that such Old Testament Texts speak of Christ, who will not believe the Apostles themselves? And to conclude this, I shall only give you a Specimen, how they deal with the New Testament also, in two or three Instances.

I shall begin with the Form of Baptism; Go ye 28 Matth. 19. *therefore and teach all Nations, baptizing them in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.* All the Fathers have made this an Argument, that Father, Son, and Holy Ghost are One God, because we are baptized in their Name, and we must not be baptized in the Name of any Creature; for to be baptized in their Name, signifies to be devoted and consecrated by a Sacred and Religious Rite to the Faith, Worship, and Obedience of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; and it is Idolatry to joyn Creatures with God in so solemn an Act of Religion; in the same Act, whereby we give up our selves to God, to give up our selves to Creatures, in the same Form of words, without making any other difference between them, but the Order of Persons.

And it is to no purpose to dispute, What is meant by *baptizing in the Name*, for whatever that be, it signifies the very same to be baptized in the Name of

the Father, and to be baptized in the Name of the Son, and in the Name of the Holy Ghost; our Saviour makes no distinction, and we must make none; and if Father, Son, and Holy Ghost be not One God, this Form of Baptism destroys the distinction between God and Creatures, and devotes us as intirely to Creatures as to God.

Page 77.

We must consider Baptism, as the Sacrament of our Initiation into the Christian Religion, and our Admission into the Gospel-Covenant, and therefore the Persons in whose Name we are baptized is that God, who receives us into Covenant, and to whose Worship and Obedience we consecrate our selves. Our Historian says, *That to be baptized in the Name of a Person or Persons, is a Rite by which one delivers himself to the Institution, Instruction, and Obedience of such Person or Persons: so that to be baptized in the Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, is to profess to be led or guided by them, or (as Grotius expresses this matter) 'tis to declare we will admit of no other thing, as a part of our Religion, but what proceeds from these, that is, nothing but what is commanded by God or the Father, and has been delivered by his Son, the Lord Christ, and confirmed externally by Miracles, and internally with the Witness and Testimony of the Spirit, that is by the Power and Inspiration of God.*

This is a very false Account of Grotius, and therefore I shall consider it, as his own. Now I readily grant, that Baptism does include our Profession of believing the Gospel, and making that the sole Rule of our Faith and Worship; those who are baptized do own, as Grotius speaks, *tres dogmatis sui Auctores*, Three Authors of their Doctrine or Religion, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; but then Baptism be-

ing

ing a Religious Rite, it is a Religious Profession of this, a Religious devoting our selves to them, and therefore we give up our selves to their Institution and Guidance, not as to Creatures, but as to God, who is both the Author, and the Object of our Faith and Worship. No man must religiously consecrate himself to a Creature, for that is Idolatry: even among the Pagans, their Mysteries terminated on their Gods, and they were initiated by them into the Worship of that God, whose Mysteries they were; and it was never known yet, that men devoted themselves to the Institution and Guidance of any Human Doctors or Masters by Religious Ceremonies.

Now if Baptism be a Religious Rite, God and Creatures can never be made the joynt Object of Religion, and therefore the Son and the Holy Ghost, must be One God with the Father. I desire to know what is meant by being baptized *in the Name* of the Father? Is it only to take him for our Instructor and Guide? Or is it to worship and obey him for our God? And why then do not the same words in the same Religious Act signify the same thing, when applied to the Son and Holy Ghost, as they do, when applied to the Father? Let them shew me any one Instance in Scripture, where a Creature is joyned with God in any Act of Worship, much less in the Fundamental Contract of Worship (if I may so speak) wherein we devote and consecrate our selves to God.

Our Author with his usual Assurance adds, *'Tis in vain, not to say ridiculously pretended, that a Person or Thing is God, because we are baptized into it, or in the Name of it; for then Moses and John Baptist also would be Gods: Our Fathers were — all baptized unto Moses: unto what then were you baptized?'* 1 Cor. 10. 1, 2.

19 Acts 3.

and they said unto John's Baptism. That is (saith the generality of Interpreters) unto John, and the Doctrine by him delivered.

But in the first place he mis-represents the Argument; which is, That the Son, and Holy Ghost are God, because we are baptized in their Name, as we are in the Name of the Father; and together with him; *in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost*; and I confess, he had answered this Argument, could he have shewn us, that the Jews were baptized in the Name of God, and in the Name of *Moses*, for that had joyned *Moses* with God, as our Saviour joyns the Son and the Holy Ghost with the Father in the Form of Baptism.

But he is so far from doing this, that in the next place I observe, that the Jews never were literally baptized in the Name of *Moses*, or in the Name of *John*, as Christians are by our Saviour's Institution in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. *Moses* did not Baptize the Jews at all, much less in his own Name, though *St. Paul* observes, that they had a kind of Mystical Baptism under *Moses* in the Cloud, and in the Sea.

And therefore it is plain, that to *baptize into Moses* is a figurative and allusive Expression, and does not, and cannot signifie, that they were baptized in the Name of *Moses*, because it is not true; for though we should grant, as he argues, that to be *baptized into Christ*, and *baptized in the Name of Christ*, signifies the same thing, when men are literally baptized in the Name of *Christ*, yet it is a demonstration, that to be baptized into *Moses*, and baptized in the Name of *Moses*, cannot signifie the same thing; because those who were mystically baptized into *Moses*, never

6 Rom. 3.
3 Gal. 27.

never were baptized in the Name of *Moses*; and it is burlesquing Scripture to make any Phrase and Expression signifie that which never was. I will only ask this Author, Whether the Jews were baptized in the Name of *Moses*? If they were not, let him tell me, how their being *baptized into Moses* comes to signifie their being baptized in the Name of *Moses*? Could the Apostle mean by this Phrase, that they were baptized in the Name of *Moses*? that is, could the Apostle mean, what he knew was not true?

And yet I deny, that *to be baptized into Christ*, and baptized *in the Name of Christ*, signifie the same thing; for *to be baptized into Jesus Christ*, does not relate to the Form of administering Baptism in the Name of Christ, but to the effect of it, in uniting us to Christ, and incorporating us with him, as Members of his Body, which induces an Obligation of a ^{6 Rom. 3, 4.} Spiritual Conformity to his Death, in dying to Sin, and living to God. And thus the *Israelites* were baptized into *Moses*, or into the *Mosaic* Covenant, not by being baptized in the Name of *Moses*, but by mystical Sacraments; *the Cloud*, which over-shadowed and guided them, and *the Red-Sea*, which divided and gave them safe Passage, but drowned the *Ægyptians*, being Types and Figures of the Christian Baptism; but I shall not spend time in explaining this now; it is enough to shew, that it is nothing to our present Argument.

Thus it is evident, that *to be baptized into John's baptism*, does not signifie to be baptized in the Name of *John*, for *John* did not baptize in his own Name, but made Proselytes to the *Messias*, as the Apostle adds; *John verily baptized with the baptism of Repentance, saying unto the People, that they should be-* ^{19 Acts 4.}
lieve

lieve on him, who should come after him, that is, on Christ Jesus. Are not these now admirable Proofs, that we may be baptized in the Name of Creatures, because the *Israelites* were mystically baptized into *Moses*, who never literally baptized any, much less in his own Name; and that the Disciples of *John* were baptized into *John's* Baptism, that is into *John*, and that is, in the Name of *John*, which we know he never did. And yet the *Socinians*, who deny the personality of the Holy Ghost, make this Form of Baptism infinitely more absurd still: The Holy Ghost, they say, is not a Person, but the Power and Inspiration of God. Now is it not very absurd, that the Power and Inspiration of God, which is not a Person, should be joyned in the same Form with Father and Son, who are Persons? Is not this like swearing Allegiance to the King, and to his Son, and to his Power, or to his Wisdom? The Holy Spirit is plainly distinguished from the Father, and from the Son; and it seems, has a distinct Name of its own, into which we are baptized; now if the Holy Spirit be not a Person, I desire to know, how the Power and Inspiration of God is so distinct from the Father, as to justify our being distinctly baptized in the Name of the Father, and in the Name of the Holy Spirit, or of his Power or Inspiration: To be baptized into the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, is sufficient to convince any man, who is not resolved against being convinced, that the Holy Ghost is a Person, as Father and Son are Persons; otherwise it were very absurd to joyn the Holy Ghost with Father and Son, in such a Religious Dedication as Baptism is.

In

In the next place let us consider the first Chapter of St. John's Gospel, which gives a glorious Testimony to the Divinity of Christ; and a plain demonstration of the incurable perverseness of Hereticks. *In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God, the same was in the beginning with God.* Our Historian tells us, *The Trinitarian Exposition of this Chapter is absurd and contradictory.* *Tis this; In the beginning; i. e. from all Eternity.* *Ans.* *From all Eternity, is before the beginning, or without beginning, not in the beginning.* *Reply.* This is false. No man expounds *in the beginning* of Eternity: but when St. John tells us, *In the Beginning was the Word*, we say this proves the Eternity of the Word: for that which *was*, when all things began, which had a beginning, was it self before the beginning, and without beginning: especially when it was so in the beginning, that it gave beginning to every thing else; that *all things were made by him, and without him was not any thing made, that was made.*

Was the Word; i. e. was God the Son. *Ans.* *But where in Scripture is the Word called God the Son?* *Reply.* This Word indeed is God the Son, but we do not Paraphrase it so in this place, *In the beginning was God the Son*; but in the beginning was that Divine Person, who is called the Word.

The Word was with God; i. e. The Son was with the Father. *Ans.* *It seems then that God in this Clause is the Father.* *But was not the Son also with the Holy Ghost, and is not he too (according to the Trinitarians) God, or a God? If he is, why doth St. John only say, The Son was with the Father; and how comes the Father to engross here the Title*
of

of God to the Exclusion of the Holy Ghost :

Rep. This is true also ; the God with whom the Word was, is the Father, but that is not his Character here neither, no more than the Character of the Word is the Son. But by *God*, the Apostle here means that Original mind and Wisdom, that Supreme and Sovereign Being, whom all men called God, without making a distinction of Persons in the Godhead.

And therefore, whereas he thinks, that he has got the *Trinitarians* at an Advantage, when the Apostle adds, and *the Word was God*, his triumph is vain. *What* (says he) *shall we do here ? was the Word the Father ? for so they interpreted God in the foregoing Clause.* No ! no ! neither so, nor so. *The Word was God*, signifies the Word was a Divine Person in the Godhead : and the Verse is very plain ; *In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God*, intimately and inseparably united to him, and that not as a Faculty or Power, as Reason is in Human Minds, but as a Divine subsisting Person, for *the Word was God*.

God is the Name of a Being absolutely Perfect, and the Light of Nature teaches us, that there is but One such Supreme Being, or but One God ; but Nature does not teach us, that there are Three Divine Persons, who are this One God ; though when Revelation has discovered this Mystery, natural Reason, is able in some measure to understand it, and see the necessity of it, as I have already shewn ; and if there be Three Divine Persons in the Godhead, Reason will tell us, that each Person is God, though all Three Persons are but One God : This is the *Trinitarian* Hypothesis, and if the words of the Evangelist

do

do easily and naturally agree with this Hypothesis, and cannot reasonably signify any thing else; that is a sufficient Argument to me, that this is the true Interpretation of the Text:

In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. That is,

In the beginning of all things was the Divine Person, whose Name and Character is The Word, this Word was inseparably united to that Supreme Being, whom we call God, and was himself God, a Divine Person subsisting in the Unity of the Godhead; not a Power and Faculty, as Reason is in Man. Can any thing be more easie and obvious, and more agreeable to the Doctrine of the Trinity? Or if you change the Subject and the Prædicate, as others will have it, and read, *God was the Word, Deus w^o ē Abz^o,* it makes no difference at all; for this Supreme Being, whom we call God, was, and is The Word, though not Only the Word: for God is the Father, and God is the Son, and God is the Holy Ghost, though God is not only the Father, nor only the Son, nor only the Holy Ghost; but the Supreme God is Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.

Now when the Evangelist had said, *That the Word was God, or God was the Word*, there was great reason to repeat, *the same was in the beginning with God*, which our Historian thinks a meer Tautology: for the Page 82. intention of it is plain, to inculcate more expressly on us, that though the Word be God, yet the Word is not all that God is; as *Grotius* well observes; for the Word was with God, and therefore a distinct Person from some other Person, who is called God, that is, that Eternal and Original Mind and Wisdom, who is the Father of the Word: And why the Name of

A Vindication of the Doctrine of the

God should peculiarly be appropriated to the Father, as the Fountain of the Deity, I have often observed.

But yet the Evangelist does in this Verse say something more than he said before, and therefore this is no Tautology: He had said, That *the Word was in the beginning*, that *it was with God*, that *it was God*: now he adds, *The same Word was in the beginning with God*; that is, was always with him, never separated from him: and this is added for the sake of what follows, That the Word was so with God in the beginning, that God made the World by his Word: For *all things were made by him*, and *without him was not any thing made, which was made*; which is another very mysterious Repetition, which nothing can give so plain an Account of as our Hypothesis. *All things were made by him*; this is full enough, without the following addition, nay indeed signifies more, than what follows, in strictness and propriety of Speech, seems to do: for that *nothing was made without him*, of it self does not signify, that he made all things, but that he had something to do in it; as he may have, who is not the principal Actor. - But our Doctrine gives a plain account of this Addition: when the Evangelist had said, That this Word, who was with God in the beginning, made all things, there was an obvious Objection: viz. then it seems, that God with whom the Word was, did not make the World; if all things were made by the Word: to have attributed the Creation of the World to the Word, so as to have excluded God from making the World, had been very absurd, and contrary to the sense of Mankind; God made the World by his Word; the Word made all things, not so as to Exclude God from making

ing the World; and God made all things, but not so as to exclude the Word; for without him was not any thing made, that was made: which is exactly what we teach, that Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, as they are One God, so they are One Creator, who made the World by One individual Act and Operation. God the Father made the World, and the Creation of all things may eminently be attributed to him, as the Fountain of the Deity, and of all Energy and Power; but he did not make the World without his Word and Spirit: *All things were made by the Word, and without him was not any thing made, that was made.*

This Account is very far from containing any thing absurd or contradictory; but to have as little dispute as may be with this Author, let us take it in that sense he would have us take it in; instead of *Word* put the *Son*, and instead of *God* put *God the Father*, and I can find none of the Contradictions he talks of: for then the words run thus; *In the beginning of all things was the Word the Son of God, and this Son of God was inseparably united to God the Father, and the Son was One God with the Father; this same Son was in the beginning with the Father; for the Father made all things by him, and without him was not any thing made, that was made.*

But let us consider what Account our Socinian Historian gives of this Chapter: He appeals to *Grotius's* Interpretation of it, but has misrepresented *Grotius*; that did an Action of Forgery lie in these Cases, many men have lost their Ears for less matters. The Account he gives of it in short is this: *Briefly, the Word (according to Grotius) is not an Eternal Son of God, but is here the Power and Wisdom of God; which Word abiding without measure on the Lord Christ,---*

Page 88.

God should peculiarly be appropriated to the Father, as the Fountain of the Deity, I have often observed.

But yet the Evangelist does in this Verse say something more than he said before, and therefore this is no Tautology: He had said, That *the Word was in the beginning*, that *it was with God*, that *it was God*: now he adds, *The same Word was in the beginning with God*; that is, was always with him, never separated from him: and this is added for the sake of what follows, That the Word was so with God in the beginning, that God made the World by his Word: For *all things were made by him*, and without him was *not any thing made, which was made*; which is another very mysterious Reiteration, which nothing can give so plain an Account of as our Hypothesis. *All things were made by him*; this is full enough, without the following addition, nay indeed signifies more, than what follows, in strictness and propriety of Speech, seems to do: for that *nothing was made without him*, of it self does not signify, that he made all things, but that he had something to do in it; as he may have, who is not the principal Actor. - But our Doctrine gives a plain account of this Addition: when the Evangelist had said, That this Word, who was with God in the beginning, made all things, there was an obvious Objection: *viz.* then it seems, that God with whom the Word was, did not make the World; if all things were made by the Word: to have attributed the Creation of the World to the Word, so as to have excluded God from making the World, had been very absurd, and contrary to the sense of Mankind; God made the World by his Word; the Word made all things, not so as to Exclude God from making

ing the World; and God made all things, but not so as to exclude the Word; for without him was not any thing made, that was made: which is exactly what we teach, that Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, as they are One God, so they are One Creator, who made the World by One individual Act and Operation. God the Father made the World, and the Creation of all things may eminently be attributed to him, as the Fountain of the Deity, and of all Energy and Power; but he did not make the World without his Word and Spirit: *All things were made by the Word, and without him was not any thing made, that was made.*

This Account is very far from containing any thing absurd or contradictory; but to have as little dispute as may be with this Author, let us take it in that sense he would have us take it in; instead of *Word* put the *Son*, and instead of *God* put *God the Father*, and I can find none of the Contradictions he talks of: for then the words run thus; *In the beginning of all things was the Word the Son of God, and this Son of God was inseparably united to God the Father, and the Son was One God with the Father; this same Son was in the beginning with the Father; for the Father made all things by him, and without him was not any thing made, that was made.*

But let us consider what Account our Socinian Historian gives of this Chapter: He appeals to *Grotius's* Interpretation of it, but has misrepresented *Grotius*; that did an Action of Forgery lie in these Cases, many men have lost their Ears for less matters. The Account he gives of it in short is this: *Briefly, the Word (according to Grotius) is not an Eternal Son of God, but is here the Power and Wisdom of God; which Word abiding without measure on the Lord Christ,*—

Page 88.

A Vindication of the Doctrine of the

'tis therefore spoken of as a Person, and as one Person with Christ, and he with that. Whoever will be at the pains to consult *Grotius*, will soon see, what credit is to be given to this *Socinian*; but it is no wonder, that those Men pervert Human Writings, who having nothing else to value themselves upon but perverting the Scriptures. But what Agreement there is between this *Socinian* and *Grotius*, I shall show in some few particulars, by comparing their Expositions with each other; by comparing *Grotius*, as he is represented by this Historian, with *Grotius* himself.

Brief History:

Grotius.

1 John 1.

In the beginning] That is, when God created the Heavens and the Earth.

So also *Grotius*. But adds was; *jam tum erat*, was when all things began; and shows, that among the *Hebrews*, this was a popular Description of Eternity to be before the World, 17 *John* 5. And to this purpose Applies the words of *Justin Martyr* concerning the word *περίπατος* *περὶ τὸ αἰώνον*, he was before the Worlds.

Was the Word] The Hebrews call, that Power and Wisdom of God, by which he made the World, and does all other his extraordinary works. The Word,

The Word] He owns, it is called the Word in allusion to what *Moses* says, That God said let there be Light. But he calls this Word, *ὁ λόγος*, *περὶ τὸ αἰώνον*.

33 Psal.

33 Psal. 6. 11 Hebr. 2. 2
Pet. 3. 5. *They borrowed this
Expression from Moses ;
God said let there be light,
1 Gen. 3.—undoubtedly
Moses is not to be under-
stood of a Word orally spo-
ken ; for God is a Spirit ;
but his meaning is, God put
forth his Power & Wisdom,
and thereby created Light
and the Firmament, &c.*

This is a direct opposi-
tion to Grotius, whom he
pretends to follow, and his
Reason is as silly, as his
Authority is counterfeit :
for why could not an in-
finite Mind, beget a sub-
stantial Word, the substan-
tial Image of his own
Power and Wisdom ; and
by this Word make the
World ; and why may not
this be represented by his
saying, *Let there be Light* ;
for since he confesses, this
was not an *oral word*, why
should it be represented
by speaking, or saying, if
God have not an eternal,
substantial Word, by which

ποιαν, Power, Efflux, Ema-
nation, in the same sense
as the ancient Christians
used them, to signify a
Substantial Word, Power,
Emanation. In this sense
he shows, that it is used
in the ancient Books of the
Chaldeans, and by the
Writer of the *Orphicks* ;
by *Heraclitus* and *Zeno*,
as *Tertullian* and *Lastan-
tius* affirm. Nay, that the
Stoicks, and *Platonists*,
and especially *Philo Ju-
deus* uses it in the same
sense ; who attributes the
making of the World to
the Word, which he calls
the Name, the Image, the
Son of God. To which
purpose he before cited
Rabbi Eliezel, that *God*,
and his Name, were be-
fore the World was made ;
and explains this by the
sayings of some Fathers,
as all meaning the same
thing, and we know, they
meant by it a Divine Per-
son.

he

he made the World: there must be some foundation for such forms of speech, and since it is evident, God did not create all things by an oral Word or Command, there is no pretence for this expression, *God said, Let there be Light*, unless there be a Divine Person, who is the Word and Wisdom of God, by whom he made the world; especially since this Phrase of *Moses* is thus expounded both in the Old and New Testament, that God made the world by his Word, which is every where represented as a Divine subsisting Person.

The Word was with God]
i. e. *It was not yet in the World, or not yet made Flesh; but with God.* So that to be *with God* signifies nothing but not to be in the world.

The Word was with God]
Grotius does say, that this is opposed to the Words being made Flesh, and appearing in the world: but he was far enough from thinking, that these words have only a negative sense, that to be with God, signifies only not to be in the world: for he tells us, what

The

the positive sense is, that with God is *verum et reale*, with the Father (the very sense which our Historian before rejected as absurd) and explains it by what Wisdom lays, 8 Prov. 30. *Then I was by him, as one brought up with him, and I was daily his delight, rejoicing alway before him;* which he does not think a *Prosopopœa*, but spoken of a subsisting Person.

The Word was God] Here Grotius produces numerous Testimonies to prove that that Divine Person, who is called the Word, not the Faculty of Wisdom and Power in God, is God.

The Word was God] i.e. *The Word (or Divine Wisdom and Power,)* (that is, not a substantial personal Wisdom and Power, but such a Faculty, as Reason and Wisdom is in man) *is not something different from God, but being his Wisdom and Power is God* (as the wisdom of man is man) 'tis the common maxim of Divines, that the Attributes and Properties of God are God: which is in some sense true. The meaning of that Maxim is, that there are no Powers or Fa-

culties.

culties in God, as there are in created Minds, but God is a pure and simple Act, and therefore what are and must be distinct Powers and Faculties in created Minds, must be distinct Persons in the Godhead. And thus whatever is in God is God, as each Divine Person is. But if there be distinct Powers and Faculties in God, as there are in men, then the Wisdom of God is not God, nor the Power of God, God; no more than the Understanding is the Man, or the Will the Man, or the Memory the Man.

He adds, *That those Persons (whether Angels or Men) to whom the Divine Word hath been in an extraordinary degree Communicated, have also had the Names of Jehovah and God communicated to them.*

He says indeed, that the ancient Hebrews and Primitive Christians teach, that when an Angel is in Scripture called *Jehovah*, it is not a meer Angel, *sed cui adfuerit & Abz*, such an Angel, to whom the Word is joyned or united, (not as the Historian says to whom the Divine Wisdom has been in an extraordinary

Holy and Ever Blessed TRINITY.

Brief History.

225

Grotius

ordinary degree commu-
nicated; that is an extra-
ordinary wise Angel, for
there is no other sense in
it) but I know not what
Grotius meant by the U-
nion or Presence of the
Word with the Angel; but
I know the Primitive
Christians asserted, That
the Angel called *Jehovah*,
was the Word.

Ver. 1. *The same was in the beginning with God.* Grotius assigns this Rea-
son of the Repetition, that
this is here repeated by the Evangelist, because the Evangelist had
called the Word God, he
that the Word is so God, would have us understand,
that it is not all, that God is so God, that he
is, there being other Persons also with God; that is,
Persons and Attributes, that the Word is not all
communicable, as well as that God is, but only One
the Word. So that the Person in the Godhead:
Word is but an Attribute, which he observes that O-
f God, and a communicable Person, and others after him,
ble Attribute, and by one called the Distinction of
of God's communicable Persons, who the Pri-
Attributes. So that these Primitive Christians, and
may be many Words, for *Jehovah* himself, used that
the Word, as he just now word *Hypostasis* in a dis-
said, may be communicated in several sense; and the Chri-
ted to Angels and Men, in stians seemed to take up
such a degree that the this sense of it from the

Name *Jehovah* may belong to them; and then why does St. *John* call *the Word* the *monogenes*, or the only begotten of the Father. *Platonists*: But whatever becomes of the Phrase, this is plainly what *Grotius* meant by the Word's *not being all, that is God*, that is, that he is but One Person in the Godhead, not that he is but One communicable Attribute in God.

This is sufficient to show how our Historian has abus'd this Great Man, when he represents him, as making the Word only the Divine Wisdom and Power, not a Divine Person; and all his other misrepresentations depend on this, and need not be particularly examined.

But I perceive our *Socinian* Historian is ashamed of that Exposition which *Socinus*, and his genuine Disciples, give of this Chapter, which had been a sign of some Understanding and Modesty, had he not invented as foolish and senseless an Interpretation himself, for it is not *Grotius's*, but his own.

Socinus was sensible that *the Word* must signify a Person, but would allow it to be no more than a Man, called *the Word*, not with respect to his Nature, but Office, as the greatest and most excellent Prophet, who reveals God's will to the world. Our Historian was convinced, that *the Word* must be something Divine, which was with God from the beginning of the world, and was not different from God, but is God, and did create all things at first, and was in a sense
In-

Incaruate ; was made Flesh, did abide in, and inhabit an human Person, the Person of Jesus : So far is very well. But then he will not allow the Word to be a Person, but a Divine Quality or Accident, the Wisdom or Power of God ; and the fault of this is, that it is unintelligible Nonsense, to describe *the Word* so pompously, as distinct from God, but with God in the beginning, and himself God, and to ascribe the making of the world to him, and tell us, that he was made Flesh ; and all this while the world is only a communicable Attribute in God, what we call the Faculty of Reason in Men : This is a new way of making a God of a *Prosopopæa*, and incarnating a *Prosopopæa*, which must be a very figurative God, and Incarnation. But I observed before, that when any Vertue or Power or Faculty is spoken of as a Person, what is said of the Vertue or Power belongs to the Person in whom that Vertue and Power is : and what that is said to do, is done by the Person, or else it is not a figurative but a false and absurd form of speech : As when Charity is said to suffer long, and is kind ; the meaning is, a charitable man is so ; a *Prosopopæa* is easily understood, and conveys its sense clearly and elegantly to our minds ; but where there is nothing but Nonsense at the bottom, it must not be made a figure, for a figurative Speech is good sense. Let us then examine his *Prosopopæa* by this Rule.

In the beginning was the Word, that is, the Wisdom and Power of God ; and this Wisdom and Power of God was with God, that is, God was with himself ; and this Wisdom and Power of God was God, that is, God was God : what sense I beseech you is there in this?

That the Wisdom and Power of God made the
G g 2 world,

world, I grant is sense, because God did make the world; but if there be any sense in *the world's being made Flesh*, it is certain, that God is Incarnate. For the Wisdom and Power of God, which is with God, and is God, cannot be Incarnate, unless God be Incarnate. Unless we can divide God from his Wisdom, and separate the Wisdom of God, [which was with him from the beginning,] from God, [to be Incarnate in Man. The Wisdom of God can no more be Incarnate, unless God can be Incarnate, then the Wisdom of an Angel can be Incarnate, without the Incarnation of the Angel: and thus this Socinian is turned Sabellian, and Patropassian.]

However, I confess, we are beholden to this Historian, for he has given up this place to us, which is one of the most express places for the Divinity of our Saviour. He allows, that *the beginning* is the beginning of all things; that *Word* signifies something Divine; even the Wisdom and Power of God; that to be *with God*, is to be intimately present with him; that to be *God*, is to be God himself. That *all things were made by him*, is meant of the first Creation of the world; that this Divine Word was made Flesh, and did abide on the human Person of Christ Jesus; the only difference between us is, whether this Word, of whom all these things are said, be a *Divine Person*, or only *the communicable attribute of Wisdom and Power in God*; and this after what I have said, I leave to any man of common understanding to determine.

But what becomes of his beloved Socinus all this while? when the very Master-piece of his Wit and Invention is rejected by his own Disciples; for if this Socinian be in the right, his Master was greatly in the

wrong

220

By

By the *Word* he understands a Person, but One who is the *Word*, not by Nature, but Office: by the beginning he understands the beginning of *John* the Baptist's Preaching; in this beginning the *Word* was; that is, Christ was in being, was in the world, when *John* the Baptist began to preach; a great discovery! But *he was with God*, known to God only at that time; which is very hardly true; and *was God*, by Dignity and Office, not by Nature. *All things were made by him*, not created; the world was not made by him; but all things are new made by him; that is, all who believe in him, are made new Creatures; and after a great many great things said of this *Word*, at last the Evangelist discovers this great Mystery, the *Word was made Flesh*, that is, the *Word* was a Man.

If this be not ridiculing Scripture nothing is; I am sure it represents the Evangelist very ridiculously, to tell the World, that Christ, who was half a year younger than *John*, was in the world when *John* began to preach; but how great a Person he was, and what his Office was, was then known only to God. Which if it were true, is no great Mystery; and to say this in such a mysterious pomp of words, as there is nothing like it in all the Scripture, is such a vain affectation; as no School-master, but an arrant Fop, would endure in a School-boy.

I shall not go about industriously to confute that, which they themselves begin to be ashamed of, but shall only lay down one rule of expounding Scripture, and all other Writings, which is a very reasonable one, and will easily answer all the Art and Fallacy which is used in this Cause; and that is this, to expound all words and phrases to a proper and literal sense, and to the utmost extent of their signification, where

where the Circumstances of the place do not require a figurative and limited sense; if we do not allow this, there is no certain rule of expounding, but men may interpret, according to their own Fancies and Imaginations, to any sense that the word was ever used in; and then we may make any thing of any thing, even a good Catholick of *Socinus* himself.

Now according to this Rule, *in the beginning* must signify the first beginning of all things; for that is *beginning* in its utmost Latitude, and that is the proper signification of beginning, when there is nothing to limit it, and there is nothing here. *Was the Word* must signify the Word did subsist, and therefore is a Person; *God* must signify *God by Nature*, which is the first and proper signification of the Word, not a Metaphorical God by Dignity and Office, for there is nothing to incline it to that sense: *All things were made by him, and without him was nothing made that was made*, must signify the first Creation of all things, when God made the world by his word; for that is the proper Notion of making all things, to give being to them, and as there is nothing in the Text to require any other sense, so its relation to *in the beginning*, when God made all things by his word, determines it to this sense: This is all true and certain, if it be a good Rule to expound words in a proper sense, when there is nothing that requires an improper and metaphorical sense: And then it is nothing to the purpose to show, that in the beginning sometimes signifies the beginning of the Gospel, that God sometimes signifies a metaphorical God, that making all things, sometimes signifies new making all things, for all this I allow, when the Circumstances of the place require it, when there is any thing added to
determine

determine these words to this sense, but will never allow it, where there is not, and therefore cannot allow it here; and if we must expound these words properly in this place, there is an end of this Controversie.

But I must hasten to a Conclusion, and therefore this shall serve at present as a Specimen, how these men pervert Scripture, and impose forced and ridiculous senses on it; and by the help of what I have now discoursed, it will be easie to detect all their other Fallacies, and rescue the Scriptures from their perverse Comments; as I shall be ready at any time to shew, when I find a just occasion for it.

Secondly, *Socinianism*, as reasonable and accountable a Doctrine as our Historian says it is, makes the Jewish œconomy very unreasonable and unaccountable. The Jewish Worship was External and Ritual, but very pompous and mysterious, and had there not been something very Divine and Mysterious præfigured by it, it had been no better than a Childish piece of Pageantry, unworthy of the Wisdom of God, unworthy of the Nature of Man. But the New Testament assures us, that all these mysterious Ceremonies were Types of Christ, and were accomplished in him; *in whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge*; or in whom are all the hidden Treasures (*ἀκρυβία σοφίας καὶ γνώσεως*) of wisdom and knowledge; that is, all those Treasures of wisdom and knowledge, which were formerly hid and concealed under the Types of the Jewish Law; for they were but a shadow of things to come, but the Body is of Christ. And yet if Christ were no more than a meer Man, the Antitype falls very short of the Types; I shall instance at present only in the Temple, and its Worship and Ministers.

The

The Tabernacle and Temple was God's House, where he chose to dwell by the visible Symbols of his Presence; and was so contrived as to be a Figure both of Heaven and Earth; for so the Apostle to the *Hebrews* expressly tells us, that the Holy of Holies was a Figure of Heaven, into which the High Priest only entered, and that but once a year, to make Expiation; and therefore the other Courts of the Temple, which were for their daily worship, did represent the Earth, on which men worship God: for God being the Maker and Sovereign Lord of the world, who has Heaven for his Throne, and Earth for his Footstool, it was fitting the House where he dwelt should be an Emblem and Figure of the whole world.

But we must all confess, that this was a very unaccountable and insignificant Ceremony, for God, who fills Heaven and Earth with his Presence, to dwell in a House made with hands; to appoint this the peculiar place of his worship, ordinarily to accept no Sacrifices, but what were offered there, &c. Had it not prefigured something more Divine and Mystical, *Solomon* in his Prayer of Dedication might well say, *1 Kings 8, 27. But will God indeed dwell on the Earth? Behold the Heaven, and Heaven of Heavens cannot contain Thee, how much less this House that I have built.*

The Temple then was a Figure, and we must enquire what it was a Figure of. Now a typical Presence can be a Figure of nothing, but a real Presence, and God's Personal dwelling among Men: for Presence and Habitation can signify nothing but Presence, and a Figure must be a Figure of something that is real: and nothing can answer to a figurative visible Presence of God, but a personal visible Presence.

Now

Now our Saviour calls his Body the Temple, *Destroy this Temple, and in three days I will raise it up:* which St. John tells us, *He spake of the Temple of his Body.* The Temple then, which was God's House, where he dwelt, was but a Figure of Christ's Body; Christ's Body then was that in truth and reality, which the Temple was but a Figure of; that is, God's visible Presence on Earth. But God was not visibly present on Earth, unless he were personally united to Human Nature; that the Body of Christ was the Body of God, or of the Divine Word, by as true and real an Union, as any man's Body is his. Thus God may be personally and visibly present among men, as a man, though his Soul be as invisible as the Deity, is yet visibly present by his Union to a visible Body: But if Christ be not God incarnate, if the Divine Word be not personally united to Human Nature, the Body of Christ is but as figurative a Temple, as the Temple at *Jerusalem* was, and then one Figure is made a Type of another, which is as great an Absurdity in Types, as a Metaphor of a Metaphor is in Speech.

God was as really present in the Temple, as he was in Christ without a personal Union: for God fills all places, and is really present every where, but yet was peculiarly present in the Temple to peculiar ends and purposes; to hear Prayers, to accept their Sacrifices and Oblations, to give forth his Oracles and Responses; and if Christ be but a meer Man, he dwells no otherwise in him, but by Inspiration; and though Christ was more perfectly inspired than the Jewish Oracle, this does not alter the Nature of God's Presence, does not make one a typical and figurative, the other a real Presence; for God is really

present in both, but not personally united to either.

The typical Presence of God in the Tabernacle and Temple is not opposed to a real Presence, by real and sensible Effects, but to a visible Presence. God is present every where, but he is invisibly present, but as he had chosen *Israel* for his peculiar People and Inheritance, so he would dwell visibly among them; but this could be done no other way, but either by taking a visible Body, or by some instituted signs of his visible Presence; the first he would not do yet, but intended to do in the fulness of time, which his own infinite wisdom had appointed for it; and in the mean time did præfigure this visible appearance of God on Earth in Human Nature by some visible Symbols of his Presence; by a visible House, wherein he dwelt, by a visible Throne, or Mercy-Seat; and by placing a visible Oracle among them: So that the Temple, as a Type, was a Type and Figure of God's visible Appearance and dwelling upon Earth; and therefore if it was a Type of Christ's Body, as Christ himself tells us it was, God did visibly dwell in Christ by a Personal Union; for nothing else can make God visible, but a Personal Union to a visible Nature.

To this St. *John* plainly alludes, when he tells us,
 1 John 14. *The Word was made Flesh, and dwelt among us, and we beheld his Glory, the Glory as of the only begotten of the Father, full of Grace and Truth; ἐκείνου ἐν ἡμῖν, Tabernacled among us, fulfilled that Type of God's dwelling in the Tabernacle, and Temple at Jerusalem, by his dwelling personally in Human Nature: and we beheld his Glory; that is, says our Historian, the glory of the man, on whom the Word did abide and inhabit in him: But St. John says, it is the glory of the*
Word

Holy and Ever Blessed TRINITY.

235

Word made Flesh; the glory of the Word, as of the only begotten of the Father, did shine in Human Nature; there were visible signs of the Glory of the Incarnate Word: This glory he says, *was beheld in his Miracles, and in his Transfiguration, and on many other occasions*: very many indeed; in his Life and Doctrine especially; for how would they have the glory of the Incarnate Word seen, but by the visible Operations of it in Human Nature? How does a Human Soul discover its glory but by visible Actions?

Thus our Saviour tells us, that he is greater than the Temple; *I say unto you, in this place is one greater than the Temple*: Now the Temple was God's House and figurative Presence, and if he were greater than the Temple, God dwelt in a more perfect manner in him: that is, he was not a symbolical visible Presence of God, which was all he could be, had he been no more than a man, but a visible God; even the Lord of the Temple, as the Prophet *Malachi* assures us: *Behold I will send my Messenger, and he shall prepare the way before me; and the Lord whom ye seek, shall suddenly come into his Temple: even the Messenger of the Covenant, whom ye delight in, behold he shall come, saith the Lord of Hosts*. This Messenger, all men own, was *John the Baptist*, *The voice of one crying in the wilderness, prepare ye the way of the Lord, make his paths straight*. Now our Historian confesses, he prepared the way for Christ: and God says, he shall prepare the way before Me, which proves that Christ is this Lord of Hosts for whom *John* was to prepare the way; but that I at present intend is, that he for whom *John* was to prepare the way, is the Lord of the Temple, for it is called *his Temple*. Now

¹² Matth. 6.

³ Mal. 1.

³ Matth. 3:

H h 2

we

we know, the Lord Jehovah was the Lord of the Temple : for the Temple was God's House, dedicated to his Name and Worship ; he dwelt in his Temple before by Types and Figures, but now he was to come visibly and personally into his Temple, and therefore he might well say, he was greater than the Temple, since he was the Lord of it ; that Incarnate God, of whom God's dwelling in the Temple was a Figure ; and which had been a very empty and insignificant Figure, unworthy of the Wisdom and Majesty of God, had it not præfigured the mysterious Incarnation of the Son of God.

13 Rev. 8.

Thus as God had a Typical House, so he had a typical High Priest, and typical Sacrifices. That the High Priest, who once a year entered into the typical Holy of Holies, was a Type of Christ, who entered into Heaven. The Apostle teaches us, 9 *Hebr.* that the Jewish Sacrifices were typical of the Sacrifice of Christ's Death ; and the several kinds of them typical of the various Effects and Vertues of Christ's Death, we learn every where in the New Testament ; which, I believe, is the true meaning, *of the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world* : not merely slain in God's Decree, for what God has decreed, shall be done, is not therefore said to be done before it is done : but this Lamb was slain in Types and Figures *from the foundation of the world* ; ever since the fall of Adam, in those early Sacrifices, which were offered after the Fall, which were typical of the Sacrifice of Christ ; for God had then promised, that *the Seed of the Woman should break the Serpents Head* ; and for my part, I must profess, I know no Principle of Natural Reason, that teaches us to offer the Blood of Beasts in Sacrifice to God ; and therefore
must

must think the Sacrifices of Beasts to be an Institution.

Now that a Human Priesthood, and the Sacrifices of Beasts were not acceptable to God in themselves, the Apostle to the *Hebrews* sufficiently proves; and I would desire some of our Learned, Reasoning *Soci-* Hebr. 8. & 10;
nians (as they think themselves) honestly to tell me, what account they can give of this Jewish Priesthood, and Sacrifices, which is becoming God: why should God be propitiated by a man, subject to the same sins and infirmities, and very often guilty of them, that other men are? why innocent Beasts must die to expiate the sins of men? when the Apostle tells us, that *it is not possible, that the Blood of Bulls and Goats* 10 Hebr. 4:
should take away sin. And yet if there were no more in it, then God's meer appointment and institution, I do not see, but the Jewish Priesthood and Sacrifices might have been as effectual as any other: I think, they are so far in the right, and consistent with their own Principles, that as they own Christ to be no more than a Man, so they make him only a metaphorical Priest, and his Death a metaphorical Sacrifice; for a meer man can be no more than a metaphorical or typical Priest and Sacrifice: but then the difficulty is, how Christ is the Antitype to the typical Priests, and Sacrifices of the Law, if he be but a metaphorical Priest and Sacrifice himself; for the Antitype ought to be that in truth and reality, which the Type is a Figure of: and though they were typical, yet they were true and proper Priests and Sacrifices, and made a true and proper Expiation for sin, as far as they reached, and therefore one would think should typifie not a metaphorical, but a true Priest and Sacrifice, though of a more excellent and perfect Nature.

Nature. This is easily accounted for, if we allow the Divine Word to be Incarnate, and to be our Priest and Sacrifice, but without this the Jewish æconomy is a most absurd and unaccountable Institution.

Thirdly, *Socinianism* ridicules the Christian Religion, that is, makes it a very mean and contemptible Institution; which I shall shew in a few words.

3 John 16.

The Fundamental Mystery of the Christian Religion is the stupendious Love of God in giving his own Son, *his only begotten Son*, for the Redemption of Mankind. This our Saviour lays great stress on; *God so loved the World, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life.* By this one would have thought, that Christ had been the Son, the only begotten Son of God, before he gave him: as *Isaac*, who was a Type of Christ, was *Abraham's* Son, before he offered him at God's Command: for that it is the Argument of Love, when we part with what we have, and what is dear to us; but this is not the Case, if *Socinianism* be true; God did not give us any Son he had before, but made an excellent Man, whom he was pleased to call his only begotten Son, (though he might have made as many such only begotten Sons as he pleased) and him he gave for us; that is, made a Man on purpose to be our Saviour. God's love indeed in redeeming sinners is very great, be the means what they will; but his love in giving *his only begotten Son* for our Redemption, which our Saviour fixes on as the great demonstration of God's love, is not so wonderful, if this giving his Son signifies no more than making a Man on purpose to be our Saviour.

In

In the next place, the Apostles mightily insist on the great love of Christ in dying for us, and his great humility in submitting to the Condition of Human Nature, and suffering a shameful and accursed Death, even the Death of the Cross. *Ye know the Grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that for your sakes he became poor, that ye through his poverty might be rich: For the love of Christ constraineth us, because we thus judge, that if one died for all, then were all dead. Let this mind be in you, which was in Christ Jesus, who being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God, but made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a Servant, and was made in the likeness of men, and being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the Cross.* Now supposing Christ to be but a meer man, who had no Being before he was born of the Virgin, who knew nothing of his own coming into the World, nor for what end he came; whose undertaking was not his own voluntary choice, but God's appointment; where is the great love, where is the great humility of this? How did he become poor for our sakes, who was never rich? Yes, says our Historian, *he could have lived in the greatest splendor, dignity, and plenty. He that could multiply the loaves and fishes, and the wine at the wedding of Cana, need not have wanted any Comforts of life.* Right! if he can prove that God would have enabled him to work Miracles, to have made himself rich and great, and to have ministered to Secular Pomp and Luxury, if he had so minded; but he being a meer Creature, could work no Miracles, nor to any other ends or purposes than God pleased; and therefore if by God's Decree he was to live a mean life.

² Cor. 8. 9.

5. 14.

² Phil. 5. 6, 7, 8.

Page 124.

life here, and dye an accursed death, and he was made for this purpose, he neither ever was rich, nor ever could be rich, and therefore did not make himself poor for our sakes. He could not by the Constitution of God have done otherwise than he did, if he would be the Saviour of Mankind, and therefore if he was not rich before he came into the World, and voluntarily chose his Poverty for us, I do not understand the great Grace of his becoming poor, for he never was rich, nor ever could be in this World.

Page 128.

Thus what is that humility our Apostle so highly commends in our Saviour: for suppose his *being in the form of God*, signifies no more than *being made like to God*, (as our Historian will have it) by a *communication of power over Diseases, Devils, the Grave, the Winds, the Seas, &c.* which dwindles the *form of God* into just nothing; for according to them he had no inherent Power to do this, but God did it at his word, as he did for other Prophets; and therefore this is *no form*, no likeness of God at all, for he did not work Miracles, as God does, by an inherent Power, but God wrought Miracles for him; yet suppose this, how is it an Argument of his humility, that he *committed not robbery by equalling himself to God*, (as he renders the words, which our Translators render, and which the ancient Fathers expound to the same sense, *he thought it not robbery to be equal to God*) that is, says he, *did not rob God of his honour, by arrogating to himself to be God, or equal to God*; though if this were robbery, both Christ and his Apostles were guilty of it, for Christ declared, *I and my Father are One*, which the Jews understood (and they did not mistake him in it) was to make himself God; and the Apostles do this frequently in express terms, as I have already

already shown: but to allow his Interpretation, I only ask, whether Christ, if he would, could have committed this Robbery? whether upon their supposition of his being a meer Man, if he had arrogated to himself to be God, God would have permitted this? and suffered him to have wrought Miracles, to cheat the world into this belief? if he could not, it is ridiculous to talk of his humility in not doing it; and I am sure it is ridiculous upon their Hypothesis, to say, that he could.

But he took upon him the form of a Servant; i. e. became like a Servant, possessing nothing of his own, and suffering injuries and reproaches, &c. But how did he take this form upon him, [which must signify his own free and voluntary choice,] when he did not take it, but was made so? This was the Condition, which he did not choose, but was made for: and what humility was this, for a meer Man, to be a Minister and Servant of God, and so great a Minister, as to be in the form of God, as he says, to be glorious for Miracles, and admired as the great power of God, especially when he was to be exalted into Heaven for it, and advanced above all Principalities and Powers? This is such Humility, as would have been Pride and Ambition in the most glorious Angel.

But he was made in the likeness of men, and being found in fashion as a man, humbled himself, &c. that is, says this Historian, being made like other men, in the common similitude of man (and I pray, how should a man be made, but like a man) he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death; i. e. notwithstanding that he could have delivered himself from them, yet was he obedient even to evil Magistrates, and without resistance under-went that death, which their wickedness

A Vindication of the Doctrine of the

and malice prepared for him; or rather, which God had decreed for him; which his hand and counsel determined before to be done: and therefore which he could not, which he ought not to avoid.

The plain Case is this: All the Circumstances of our Saviour's Birth, and Life, and Death, were so punctually foretold by the Prophets, and so peremptorily decreed by God, that after he was come into the world, there was no place for his choice and election; he could not shew either his love or his humility in choosing Poverty or Death, and therefore if it were matter of his free choice, and a demonstration of his great Humility and Love, as the Apostles says it was, he chose it before he came into the world: He was in the form of God, equal to God, rich, before, and chose to become Man, a Minister, a Servant, and to submit to a mean Life, and an infamous Death for our sakes, and this indeed was a mighty Love and stupendious Humility in the Son of God: This we can all understand; it is a venerable Mystery, and a powerful Argument of our Religion; but *Socinianism* makes Nonsense of it.

The Faith and Worship of Christ is the distinguishing Character of the Christian Religion, and if Christ be no more than a Man, as the *Socinians* teach, it is a direct Contradiction, both to Natural and to the Moisaical Religion, which condemn the worship of any Creature, and all Religious Trust and Assistance in them. It is a Religion without a Priest, and without a Sacrifice, or which is much the same, retains the Name of a Priest and a Sacrifice, without any proper Atonement or Expiation; which is a very unfit Religion for sinners: But that which is most to my present purpose is, that it makes a God of a meer Creature, and makes

Holy and Ever Blessed TRINITY.

243

makes a Mediator and King without any inherent Power, to save Sinners, to protect his Church, to govern or to judge the World, which is a meer Pageant and Shadow of a King.

To make a Mediator or Mediatory King, who shall be a fit Object of Religious Hope and Trust and Worship (as I have already explained it at large) he must have a Personal Knowledge of all our particular Wants, and an Inherent Power to help us; and though his Humane Nature is confined to Heaven, his Knowledge and Power must extend to all the world; as he himself tells us after his Resurrection, *All Power is given unto me, both in Heaven and in Earth*: particularly, he must have Power to protect his Church on Earth from all her Enemies, to restrain and govern the malice of Men and Devils; to forgive sins, to give the fresh Supplies of Grace, to raise the Dead, to judge the World, to condemn bad men to Hell, and to bestow Heaven upon his sincere Disciples.

Let us then consider, what account our *Socinian* Historian gives of this matter, and what a kind of Mediator and King he makes of Christ. Sometimes to abuse the World, he tells us, *the Socinians generally* Page 108. *not only grant, but earnestly contend, that Christ is to be worshipped and prayed to; because God hath (they say) by his inhabiting Word or Power given to the Lord Christ, a faculty of knowing all things, and an ability to relieve all our wants.* Now if they mean honestly, that Christ has an inherent Personal Knowledge and Power, whereby he knows, and can do all things, this is to ascribe true Divine Perfections to him, for such are infinite Knowledge, and infinite Power; and that is to make him a true and real God;

and I think, there is not greater Nonsense in the World, than a Made-God, than a Creature-God, as I showed before; But it is plain our Historian is none of these *Socinians*, for all his Expositions lean another way; and in the same place he disputes earnestly against praying to Christ, and says, that *those Gentlemen* (he must mean the *Socinian* Gentlemen, who are for praying to Christ, especially the *Polonian* Zealots) *say, that Christ's Mediation and Intercession for us, is not to be understood of a Verbal or Personal Mediation, proceeding from a particular Knowledge of our Wants and Prayers* (and thus we have already lost this Faculty in Christ of knowing all things) *but he Mediates by his Merits; that is* (not by his Expiation and Sacrifice, but) *by the perfect Obedience and most acceptable Services, that he has performed to God.* So that these *Socinians* are all of a mind as to this matter, that whatever they seem to talk of *Christ's Faculty of knowing all things, and Ability to relieve all our Wants*, his Knowledge is only by Inspiration, as the Knowledge of other Prophets is, not an abiding, inherent Faculty; and does not extend to all things, nor to the present and particular Wants and Necessities of his Church, much less of every particular Christian, nay, not to the prayers that are made to him; and then I confess, I see no reason to pray to him; and his Ability to help is not an inherent Power to do those things for us, which we need, and which we pray for, but only to intercede for us with God, and that not particularly neither, but only in general, for he does not always know our particular Wants. Christian Ears know not how to bear such talk as this, which makes a Mediator and Mediatory Kingdom an empty insignificant Name and Title, without any other

other Power but Prayers : And that this is the Mind and Belief of our Historian, I shall now briefly show, and will leave all Men to judge, whether this be not to ridicule the Scriptures and Christianity together.

I. First then let us consider, what the Knowledge of our Saviour is : and two or three places will suffice for this purpose, for they are very full and express. St. John tells of Christ, *He knew what was in* 2 John 25.
man. To which he answers, *The Knowledge which* Page 50.
the Lord Christ had, or now in his state of Exaltation
hath, of the secrets of mens hearts, is the pure gift of
God, and revelation from God, and the Divine Word
abiding on him : that is, Divine Inspiration, for he means no more by *the Divine Word abiding on him :* this is a plain abuse of the Text, and the Reason of it, *He knew what was in Man,* is the Reason assigned, why he needed no External Information or Testimony of Man, *needed not that any one should testify of man,* for *αὐτὸς* he himself *knew what was in man, and knew all men ;* which, according to the propriety of words, signifies an inherent Personal Knowledge, in opposition to any External Manifestation, and therefore to Revelation it self : for he always knew all men, which cannot be done by Revelation, which is particular and occasional. But this is not our Dispute at present, but only to show, what this Socinian thinks of it.

The same he tells us with reference to the last Judgment, 2 Rom. 16.
 when Christ shall *judge the secrets of men, the* 1 Cor. 4.3.
knowledge Christ hath, or at the last Judgment shall Page 119.
have of the secrets of hearts, is purely by Revelati-
on from God, and the Divine Word communicated to
him. This he repeats again in answer to what Christ
 saith

2 Rev. 23.
Page 154.

faith in the Revelations, *I am he which searcheth the reins and heart.* "The knowledge which the Lord Christ had, or hath, of any ones secret thoughts, is a Revelation made to him by God, as it was also sometimes to former Prophets, --- *Prophets search the heart,* (which was never said of any Prophet, for to search the heart is to look into the heart, and see the secrets there, not to know them by Revelation) *that is, know the thoughts and propensions of the heart, by the Spirit or Inspiration of God in them.* But the Lord Christ hath a far greater measure of that Spirit, than any of the former Prophets ever had: that is, God reveals more to Christ, than ever he did to any former Prophets, but it is only Revelation still, not an inherent Knowledge. In all these places to prove that Christ's knowing what is in man, judging the secrets of men, searching the reins and heart, can signify no more, than that Christ has this Knowledge by Inspiration, he proves from the first words of St. John's Revelations; *The Revelation of Jesus Christ, which God gave to him, to shew unto his Servants things which must shortly come to pass.* Which does not signify, that this was a Revelation made to Christ, but that Revelation which Christ made; for though God is said to give it to him, it is to shew unto his Servants, that is, by the appointment of God Christ shewed this Revelation to John. Thus when St. John saw a Lamb, having seven horns, and seven eyes, which are the seven Spirits of God, sent forth into all the Earth: he says, *This Text confirms what has been often said, namely, that the Knowledge which our Lord Christ now hath of Affairs on Earth, is (partly) by means of these ministering Spirits which are sent forth into all the Earth, as his eyes, to see and relate the state*

4 Rev. 1.

5 Rev. 6.
Page 156.

state of things : for what other reason can they be here called his eyes. I shall not now dispute, what the meaning of this is, it is enough that we know his Opinion, that Christ now in Heaven knows nothing of the Affairs on Earth, but either by the Revelation of God, or the Ministry of Angels; and it seems, notwithstanding *the Divine Word abiding on him*, God does not reveal all things to him, but he is fain to use the Ministry of Angels to be more perfectly acquainted with the Affairs of his Church. And thus much for his Knowledge; and I confess, I desire a Mediator who knows more, and in a more perfect manner.

2. Let us now consider his Power, which the Scripture speaks so magnificently of, and which Christ himself calls *all Power both in Heaven and Earth*: and yet our Socinian tells us, that this *all Power* is no other Power but Intercession; that Christ has no inherent Power in himself, can do nothing at all, but intercedes with God to do it.

He expressly tells us, and lays it down as a Principle, that Christ's Intercession is inconsistent with an inherent Power in him, to hear and help us himself.

For if he doth hear our Prayers, and can and doth (by a Power constantly resident in him) relieve our Wants, to what purpose is he our Mediator with God?

What can be more evident than that here (7 Hebr. 25.) Page 110, 111.

Christ's saving us from the evils we either fear, or labour under, is ascribed not to his own inherent Power, but to his Intercession with the Almighty.

Thus Christ promises to be always with his Church, 18 Math. 20. and a very comfortable Promise it is; for we may expect a constant protection from him; but our Hi-

storian

Page 76.

Historian tells us, that Christ is neither present with us, nor can help us himself; *but Christ is in the midst of, and is with his People, not by an immediate presence, as God is, but by his most powerful aid and help, which he affords, partly by his continual and successful Mediation with God for them all in general; partly by the Angels who are under his Directions, and by him engaged in the defence of the Faithful.* So that Christ's Promise to be always with us, does not signify, that he will be with us, but that he intercedes for us with God, not particularly for you and me, for he knows not what our particular Condition is, but for all in general; and directs the Angels to take care of all the Faithful, and leaves it to their discretion, how to do this, for he can only direct, as he intercedes, in general, being ignorant of our particular Condition.

14 John 14.
Page 98.

Christ promises, *If you ask any thing in my Name, I will do it;* and for my part I always believed our Saviour could do it, as he promised; but he tells us, *the obvious meaning is, if you pray for any thing to God, using my Name, I will cause it to be done for you, by my Intercession.* Well! but will he particularly intercede for us? No; but *the general Intercession I will make for all good Christians.*

Nothing is a greater support to Christians under all their Temptations and Sufferings, than to remember, that they have a merciful and compassionate High Priest, *who is touched with a feeling of our Infirmities, being in all things tempted as we are,* which the Apostle urges as a great encouragement to us, *to come boldly to the Throne of Grace, that we may obtain mercy, and find grace to help in time of need.* But this Argument is lost, if our High Priest does not par-

particularly know what our wants are, nor when we want help, and does not intercede in particular for us, but only generally for all: and they who are not sensible of this, do not consider the state of Human Nature; for the hope of Sinners is in their Advocate and Mediator, and in his Compassion for them; but if he know not their wants, his general Intercession gives them less hope. And yet this great Consolation of Sinners is destroyed by this Socinian, who resolves all only into a general Intercession, That our High Priest having been in our very Circumstances, is *Page 145.* touched with a true feeling of our Infirmities, and therefore doth with great earnestness intercede for us all in general. But let us consider the particular Exercise of this Mediatory Power.

One glorious Act of Power is to forgive sins, but this is wholly taken away by our Historian. Our Saviour challeng'd this Power, while he was on Earth; *The Son of Man hath power on Earth to forgive sins.* *9 Matth. 6.* And because our Saviour challenges it, he dares not *Page 74.* deny it in plain terms, but expounds it away. He says, *God gave this Authority to the Lord Christ, because he gave to him also to know what was in mens hearts: namely, whether their Repentance and outward Professions were sincere and lasting:* that is, Christ had not a direct Authority to forgive sins, but a declarative Authority; that their sins were forgiven upon a certain Knowledge of the sincerity of their Repentance.

Nay, Christ is so far from forgiving sins, that our Author will not allow that they are forgiven in his Name, or for his sake, as appears from his Paraphrase on what our Saviour says; *Thou Repentance and Re-*

24 Luke 47. *mission of sins should be preached in his Name. The sense (says he) is, Christ commanded the Disciples to require men to repent, and on their so doing to assure them in his Name (or from him) that God would forgive them. God deliver us from such Expositors, who expound away the whole Gospel of our Saviour.*

15 John.

17 Luke 5.
Page 80.

2 Cor. 12 8,9.

Page 124.

Another Act of Mediatory Power, which is absolutely necessary to the Christian Church, is to give the fresh Supplies of Grace according to the Needs and Necessities of Christians; but though Christ represents himself as a Vine, and Christians as Branches in the Vine, who derive their Spiritual Life and Nourishment from him; yet our Historian will not allow that he can do any thing in this neither, but only intercede with God to give his Grace to us. Thus when *the Apostles said unto the Lord, Increase our Faith*; his Comment is, *by thy Prayers to God, which are always heard for us.* When St. Paul besought the Lord thrice, that it (the Thorn in the Flesh, the Messenger of Satan to buffet him) might depart from him, and received an Answer, *My Grace is sufficient for thee; for my strength is made perfect in weakness.* His Comment is, *He besought the Lord; that is, he besought God; though we know in St. Paul's Epistles, The Lord, without any other addition, is commonly used for the Lord Christ.* And so it is here; where *my strength* is immediately interpreted to be *the power of Christ*, and therefore he adds, *the Power of Christ here is the strength or power which Christ procures by his general Mediation (for all his Church, and every Member of it) with God.* So afraid is he to own, that Christ can bestow strength and power on us himself to conquer tempta-

Holy and Ever Blessed TRINITY.

251

temptations. But still he was sensible, this was to offer force to the words, and therefore says, *That the Socinians, for the most part of them do grant, that the Word or Power of God abiding on Christ, doth qualifie him to hear our Prayers, and to succour us in all Distresses.* But of this above.

Nay, he will not allow that Christ could direct or prosper St. Paul's Journey, but only by his general Intercession: and that he causeth us to abound in love, and all other graces, partly by his Gospel, partly by his Intercession. 1 Thess. 13 11, 12. Page 136.

He denies that Christ raised himself from the dead by his own proper Power; and though he shall raise and change our Bodies at the last day, yet it is by the Divine Word and Power communicated to him, and abiding on him, by which he raised Lazarus, which he says, Christ himself intimates was not his own proper Power, but God's, that is, the Father's. And lest this should be thought too much that Christ should raise the dead, though by his Father's Power, not his own, he adds, *Almighty God can lodge even in dry bones, a power of restoring the dead;* 2 Kings 13. 21. which is a very honourable Comparison for our Saviour; and shows what a mighty Opinion he has of his Power; which is only lodged in him, as it was in the Prophets dry bones, and is no more his own Power. But this lodging Power in dry Bones, is a new kind of Philosophy, and in great request at Rome. Page 89. Page 93.

To conclude; One would think, that he should leave Christ the full Power of Judging the World, since God hath made him Judge both of the quick and of the dead. But this must be expounded away to nothing too. We heard before, that at the day of

K k 2

Judg-

Judgment, when he is to judge the secrets of hearts, he knows them only by Revelation from God; and therefore he has no Personal Qualifications to judge the World, but only bears the Name, when God the Father does the thing: But thus much he allows him; *That Christ is said to judge the World, because he shall pronounce the Decree and Sentence of God, and order the Angels to execute it.*

And now, has not this *Socinian* made a glorious King and Mediator of Christ, without the least Power to do any thing, but intercede by Prayers and Supplications with God, and that without knowing the particular Condition of those, for whom he intercedes. If this be Christianity, *sit anima mea cum Philosophis*: if this be to expound Scripture by Reason, it is plain that Scripture and Reason spoil one another; for no man would reason so foolishly, but to pervert Scripture; nor expound Scripture so absurdly, but to comply with what he calls Reason.

4. *Socinianism* justifies, or at least excuses, both Pagan and Popish Idolatries; at least as it is taught by those men, who allow of the Worship of Christ, which it is certain, the Christian Religion teaches: Now if Christ be no more than a Man, this is Creature Worship, and then Creature Worship is not Idolatry; and this goes a great way in justifying or excusing Pagans and Papists. If the Worship of a Creature be natural Idolatry, God would not have permitted the Worship of Christ; if it be not, then Pagans and Papists are no Idolaters: Though they worship Creatures, whatever their Fault be in it, (if it be so much a Fault, as a Mistake) yet it is a Fault
of

of a much less Nature than Idolatry, and more easily pardoned.

Especially when they do not worship these Creatures as the Supreme God, but as their Mediators, and Patrons, and Advocates with the Supreme God ; for there is a Worship due to a Mediator, distinct from the Worship of the Supreme God, as the Worship of Christ proves, who is not God, but a Creature-Mediator ; and thus the Heathens worshipped their inferior Deities, and thus the Papists worship their Saints : And if they do mistake, and worship those for Mediators, who are none, and can do them no Service ; the greatest hurt seems to be, that they loose their labour, but according to these Principles, they do no injury to God.

For as they tell us, when it is said, *That all men should honour the Son, even as they honour the Father*; the meaning only is, as we honour God or the Father, so we must not forget to honour also the Son of God—An equality of Honour is no more intended here, than an equality of Perfection in those words, *Be ye therefore perfect, as your Father, which is in Heaven is perfect*. So the Heathens did not intend the same degree of worship to their Mediators and Inferior Deities, as to the Supreme God ; and we know the Papists distinguish between the worship of *Latria* and *Dulia*, or that Sovereign worship which is due to the Supreme God, and that inferior honour to Saints and Angels ; and it is plain, this is not an arbitrary, but real distinction, as is evident in the worship of God, and the Man Christ Jesus, who are worshipped with different degrees of honour, as these *Socinians* assert.

John 23.
Page 92.

A Vindication of the Doctrine of the

And whereas the Papists are charged with making Gods and Goddesses of dead Men and Women, by paying Religious Worship to them, they no more make them Gods, than the *Socinians* make Christ a God.

And as for the worship of the Virgin *Mary*, they have in reason as much to say for it, as the *Socinians* have for the worship of Christ: They make Christ the Son of God, only because he was formed by a Divine Power in the Womb of the Virgin; but Papists, who believe Christ to be God, own her for the Mother of God; and I cannot see, why it is not as great an honour to be the Mother of God, as to be born of a Virgin by the Power of God, and it may be more. And in reason I cannot see (allowing of the Intercession of a Creature) why the Virgin Mother of God, should not intercede as powerfully for us, as a Man born of a Virgin by the Power of God; and I am apt to think, our Saviour will account it a less fault to worship his Mother, than to make himself a meer Creature.

And though the blessed Virgin do not particularly know our Condition, yet she may help us by her general Intercession as Christ does, and pray particularly for her peculiar Devotoes, and therefore at least we may pray to God in the Name of the Virgin, and other Saints, as *Socinians* do in the Name of Christ, who knows as little of them.

And yet the Virgin, and other Saints, may understand our Condition and Affairs the same way, that
the

the *Socinians* say Christ does, *viz.* by Revelation from God, and by the Ministry of Angels, who are sent into the World, and carry the News of this World to Heaven, though we should not allow of their Glafs of the Trinity, wherein they fee and know all things.

So that here is nothing wanting but the appointment and allowance of God, to make the blessed Virgin and other Saints as proper Advocates for us, as the *Socinians* make Christ to be; for they are as well qualified for it, or might be, if God so pleased, according to their Principles; and this the Papists think they have too, that God has appointed, or at least allows the worship of such favourite Saints; and though they are mistaken in it, it is certainly a much more innocent and pardonable mistake, to make a Mediator, whom God has not made, than to make the Eternal Son of God a Creature.

In a word, whatever evil there is in Creature worship, that the *Socinians* are guilty of in worshipping a meer man; but this is not the worst of their Case, for they overthrow the whole Christian Religion by it; which Popery does not overthrow, though it greatly and dangerously corrupts it.

S E C T.

S E C T. VII.

An Answer to what remains in the Brief Notes.

I Am now hastening to a Conclusion, and there is little behind to stop me; for though half the sheet be yet untouched, it is answered before I come to it; and therefore both to save Paper and Pains, I shall not transcribe his long impertinent Harangues, as I have hitherto done, but only give the Reader a view of those Passages which he intends for Argument or Drollery, I know not whether:

Creed.

The Son is of the Father alone, not made, nor created, but begotten.

Our Note-maker has discovered a Contradiction between the beginning and the end of this Article; for either *the Son is not of the Father alone*, or he is *not begotten*; for every Novice in Grammar, and proper Speaking, knows, that *begotten*, when it is distinguished from *made and created*, always supposes two Parents, a Mother as well as a Father. He will allow the Son to be begotten, if you speak of the Generation of the Son by the Divine Power on the Virgin Mary; for then it would have been true, that the Son is neither made, nor created, but begotten; for then he has both Father and Mother; God is his Father, and the Virgin Mary his Mother; and thus, though they will not allow the Virgin to be the Mother, they will allow her to be the Wife of God, which is as honourable.

able. These are very fit men to make Addressees to a *Marocco* Ambassador, for they are so far of *Mahomet's* mind, that God cannot have a Son, unless he have a Wife; but *Mahomet* was the better Divine in this, that he never dreamt of God's having a Woman for his Wife. I am afraid this is Blasphemy; I'm sure, we have always thought it so from the Mouth of a scoffing Atheist or Infidel; for this is not his own, but borrowed Wit.

For does our Author in earnest think, that God cannot have a Son, unless he begets him, as one man begets another? This is to dispute against God's begetting a Son, as the Epicurean in *Tully* did against God's making a World, that he wanted Ministers and Instruments for such a Work, as if God made a World, as a Carpenter builds a House. Does a Son necessarily signifie one who is begotten of two Parents? I thought the true Notion of a Son had been, one who is produced out of the Substance of its Parent, (not out of nothing, which we call *Creation*, nor formed of any other Præexistent Matter which we call *making*) and that the true Notion of *begetting*, is to produce its own Image and Likeness out of its own Substance, by what means soever this is done; and if one Parent can thus beget a Son of his own Substance, this argues greater perfection in the Father, and is a more perfect manner of Production than by two; and methinks he might allow the most perfect Being to beget a Son in the most perfect manner. And that an infinite Mind can and must beget his own likeness and image, that is, an Eternal Son, by a reflex Knowledge of himself, I have already shewn.

*Que molitio,
que ferramen-
ta, qui vestes,
que machine,
qui ministri,
tanti muneris
suerant? De
Nat. Deor. l. i.*

Supra p. 130

Creed.

The Holy Ghost is of the Father and the Son, neither made, nor created, nor begotten, but proceeding.

His first quarrel against this, is the Procession of the Holy Ghost, from Father and Son : the next is about the distinction between *being begotten and proceeding*, which he says are the same thing, and are now confessed to be so, *by the most learned Trinitarians* ; who these are, I know not, but be they who they will, it was no Argument of their Prudence or Learning to reject a distinction, which both the reason of the thing requires, and the Christian Church has always owned : but this I have accounted for before, and plainly shewn the distinction between Generation and Procession, the first is a reflex Act, whereby God knows himself, and begets his own Likeness and Image ; Procession is a direct Act, that Eternal Love, whereby God loves himself and his own Image, which proceeds from God, as all Thoughts and Passions proceed out of the Heart.

Creed.

And therefore there *is but One Father, not Three Fathers, One Son, not Three Sons, One Holy Ghost, not Three Holy Ghosts*. The second Person, is indeed the Son of the first, but the third Person, who proceeds from Father and Son, is not the Son of either ; for to proceed is not to be begotten, and therefore there are not *two Sons*, nor *two Fathers*, as this Author affirms ; much less are they *Three Holy Ghosts*, though I grant, as he says, that *they are Three Holy Spirits*. But this is a meer childish Fallacy, and playing with words : as as there is but One God, so he

is

Supra
Page 134, 135.

is a holy Being, and a pure Mind and Spirit, as Spirit is opposed to Matter; and thus all Three Divine Persons are holy Minds and Spirits, essentially united into One infinite Mind and Spirit; but the Holy Ghost, who is the Spirit of the Father and the Son, and a distinct Person in the Trinity, is but One.

In this Trinity none is before or after other, none is Creed. greater or less than another.

Yet the Son himself saith the Father is greater than I, Notes. 14 Joh. 28. And the Son himself saith, *I and the Father are One*, 10 Joh. 30. And therefore there can be no greater inequality between them, than what is consistent with an Oneness and Identity of Essence: that is, not an inequality of Nature, but Order, as a Father is greater than the Son, who is naturally subordinate to him, though their Nature be equal and the same. Though we know, the ancient Fathers understood this of Christ as Man, as it is also expressed in this Creed, *Equal to the Father, as touching his Godhead, inferiour to the Father, as touching his Manhood.* He proceeds.

As for the other Clause, *None is afore or after other; 'tis just as true, as that there is no difference between afore and after.* I ask, whether the Son doth not, as he is a Son, derive both Life and Godhead from the Father? All Trinitarians grant he does; grounding themselves on the Nicene Creed, which expressly calls the Son, God of God, Light of Light, very God of very God, begotten, not made. But if the Father gave to the Son Life and Godhead, he must have both, before he could communicate, or give either of them to the Son, and consequently was afore the Son was. No effect

is so early as its Cause; for if it were, it should not have needed, or had that for its Cause. No Proposition in Euclid is more certain, or evident than this.

Answ.

I hope, he will abate a little of his Mathematical Certainty, before I have done with him; and yet I shall quickly have done with him too. I will begin with his Philosophy of Causes and Effects. *No Effect*, he says, *is so early as its Cause*. Did he never then hear of what we call Emanative Effects, which co-exist with their Causes? Is not the Sun the Cause of Light, and Fire of Heat? and can he conceive a Sun without Light, or Fire without Heat? and if he cannot so much as in thought, without absurdity and contradiction, separate these Causes and Effects, is it possible to separate them in time, that the Cause should be before its Effect? that is, that the Sun should be without Light, and the Fire without Heat? and yet, can Light be without the Sun, or Heat without Fire? What becomes then of his Reason, which is as certain and evident as any Proposition in *Euclid*? That *if the Effect were as early as its Cause, it should not have needed, or had that for its Cause*. For Light needs the Sun, and Heat the Fire, for their Causes, and yet are as early as their Causes. But I perceive he is but a young Mathematician or Philosopher, and therefore I would desire him to remember against the next time, *That plain Matter of Fact is as certain and evident as any Proposition in Euclid*.

In all other Causes and Effects, which subsist distinctly and separately, his Maxim is good, That the Cause

Cause must be before the Effect; but when the Effect is essential to the Cause, and the Cause cannot be without it, there the Effect is as early as its Cause, because the Cause cannot subsist without its Effect, as the Sun cannot be a Sun without Light, and Fire cannot be Fire without Heat.

And this is the Case here; the Son is begotten by the Father, and is *God of God, Light of Light*, the Holy Ghost proceeds from Father and Son; but Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, are essentially but One God, and therefore unless the same One God can be afore and after himself in the Trinity, there can be no afore or after, but all Three Persons are Coeternal, because they are essentially One Eternal God: and it is in vain to confound our Minds with conceiving an Eternal Generation, for that is as intelligible as an Eternal Being; we can see the necessity of both, but cannot comprehend either, no more than we can Eternity. It is demonstrable, something must be Eternal, and it is as certain, that an Eternal Mind eternally knows it self, and loves it self; for there can be no infinite Mind without a reflex Knowledge of himself, which is his Eternal Son, nor without the love of himself and his One Image, which is the Holy Spirit: of which I have sufficiently discoursed already.

And thus we are come to the last part of our Task, what concerns the Incarnation of Christ, which after all that has been said to prove Christ to be the Eternal Son of God incarnate, will take up no great time; for what ever difficulties there may be in the Philosophy of the Incarnation, or how God and Man is united into One Person, it will not shake my Faith, who see a thousand things every day which I can give,

no,

no Philosophical Account of, and which a little Philosophy would teach considering men not to pretend to give any account of; and yet we believe our Eyes without understanding the Philosophy of things; and why we should not believe a Divine Revelation to, without it, I know not. But let's hear what he has to say.

Creed.

The right Faith is, that we believe and confess, that our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, is both God and Man.

Notes.

Then the Lord Christ is two Persons, for as he is God, he is a Person. Very right! And as he is a Man, he is a Person; that we deny, that he is a distinct Person from the Godhead, when united to God. But a rational Soul vitally united to a Human Body is a Person. Right! when it is by it self; and so a Soul without a vital Union to a Human Body is a Person; and a Beast, which has no reasonable Soul, but only an Animal Life, as a Man has together with a Human Soul, is a Person, or a Suppositum, or what he will please to call it, but it is a distinct living subsisting Being by it self, but when the Rational and the Animal Life are united in Man, he is not two Persons, a Rational, and an Animal Person, but one Person: and therefore we neither need own Christ to be two Persons with Nestorius, (which yet is much more innocent than to deny his Godhead) nor deny him either to be God or Man; for he is God-Man in one Person; as a Man is a Reasonable and Animal Creature united into One Person; though we may find the reasonable and animal life subsisting apart, and when they do so, they are two, and but one, when united. This

This is explained in the Creed by the Union of Soul and Body; for as the reasonable Soul and Flesh is One Man, so God and Man is One Christ: which he says vainly enough, is the only offer at Reason, that is to be found in the whole Creed. Well! we are glad any thing will pass with him, though it be but for an offer at reason, and let us hear how he confutes it.

1. He says, *In the Personal Union of a Soul with a Body, the Union is between Two finite things: but in the (pretended) Personal Union of God to Man, and Man to God, the Union is between finite and infinite, which (on the Principles of the Trinitarians, I wish he had told us, what those Principles are) is impossible: For we must either suppose, that finite and infinite are commensurate, that is, equal, which every one knows is false; or that the finite is united but to some part of the infinite, and is disjoyned from the rest, which all Trinitarians deny and abhor. I beg your pardon Sir! they were never so silly, as to think of it; but they abhor to see such Sacred Mysteries treated with so much Ignorance and Impudence.*

Since he is for confuting the Doctrine of the Trinity by raising Difficulties about the manner of this Union, how God and Man are united into One Person; I desire, he would first try his skill in inferior things, and tell me, how the parts of Matter hang together: which though every Body thinks, he knows, I doubt no Body does. Then I would desire to know, how Soul and Body are united, how a Spirit can be fastened to a Body, that it can no way release it self, though never so desirous of it, till the vital Union (which no Body knows, what it

it is) is dissolved? Why the Soul can leave the Body, when the Body is disabled to perform the Offices of Life, but cannot leave it before? The Soul, I say, which we *Trinitarians* believe to be a Spirit, which can pass through Matter, which cannot be touched, or handled, or held, by Matter, and yet feels the impressions of Matter, is pleased, or afflicted with them, and sympathizes with the Body, as if it could be cut by a Knife, or burnt with a Fever, or torn by wild Beasts, as the Body is.

And since he apprehends, there can be no Union without Commensuration, and therefore a finite and infinite Being cannot be united, because they are not Commensurate; I desire to know, whether he thinks the Soul and Body are Commensurate? whether the Soul have parts, as the Body has, which answer to every part of the Body, and touch in every Point? These will be very new Discoveries, if he can say any thing to them; if he can't, it is his best way to deny the Union of Soul and Body, because he cannot understand it; to assert that man has no Soul, but only a Body, because it is impossible, that Matter and Spirit should ever be united into one Person and Life; which is to the full as unreasonable, as to deny the Personal Union of God and Man, because he cannot understand how finite and infinite (which are not Commensurate, nor can be, because neither a finite, nor infinite Spirit, have any parts to be measured) can be united.

But in great good Nature, he has found out a *Salvo* for the *Trinitarians*; That God indeed is infinite, and every Soul and Body (even that of Christ) finite, yet the whole God, and the whole Man are united;

ted; because, as the whole Eternity of God doth Co-exist to a moment of time, so the whole Immenfity of God is in every Mathematical point of place: And adds, *The very truth is, they cannot otherwise defend the Incarnation, or Personal Union of an infinite God to a finite Man.*

This is Gibberish which I do not understand; but this I do understand, (which I suppose is the meaning of it, if it have any meaning) That an Eternal Being, who has no beginning, and no fucceffion of Being, may Coexist with time; and that an infinite Mind, who has no parts, or extension, is present every where, without extension: This I have fuf- Vide fupra
P. 76, 80. ficiently difcoursed already, and refer my Reader to it.

But he has a thundring Argument againft this: *But withal it must be owned, that then the Doctrines of the Trinity and Incarnation do infer; imply, and fuppofe all the Contradictions that Mr. Johnson has objected to the Doctrine of Tranfubftantiation?* I hope not all, for that is a very good Difcourfe, and I only wifh for the Author's fake, *fi fic omnia*; but pray, what is the matter? *His whole Book, and all his Demonstrations, are founded upon thefe two Suppofitions, That a longer time doth not all of it coexist in a shorter; nor is a greater extension confipated, or contained in a lefs.* Suppose this, (for I have forgot what his Demonstrations are, and have not the Book now by me) what is this to the Trinity and Incarnation? *though a longer time cannot all of it coexist in a shorter,* (which I hope is not fo loofly expreffed by Mr. Johnson, becaufe it is not fenfe, for time is in a perpetual flux, and nothing of it exists but *ad vñ*) but what is this to an Eternal Being's coexisting

M m

with

with time without time or succession? *Though a greater Extension cannot be contained in a less*, what is this to an infinite Mind's being present every where without Extension? for here is no Comparison between a longer and shorter time, but between Time and Eternity, which is not Time nor Succession; nor between a greater and less Extension, but between a finite and infinite Mind, neither of which have any Extension. But suppose the worst, how does this concern the Doctrine of the Incarnation? If he could tell how to apply all the Demonstrations of Mr. Johnson, (which he tells us in Print, he forbears to do, because the Press is not open to them) these Absurdities and Contradictions would not fall upon the Doctrine of the Incarnation, but upon the Notion of an Omnipresent God, who has no Parts, nor Extension, which was not invented to save the Difficulties of the Incarnation; but is the true Notion of God, and his Omnipresence, who is not Omnipresent by Parts, but is every where a perfect and infinite Mind; and if he can ridicule God out of the World, we will quarrel no more about the Incarnation: I do not at all wonder, that he boasts so much, what *Follies and Contradictions* he could discover in the *Athanasian Creed*; for a man who cannot understand common Sense, can never fail of finding Follies and Contradictions.

2. He proves, *That the Union between God and Man cannot make one Person, as the Union of Body and Soul does, because the Union of Soul and Body is not the Union of Two Persons, but only of One Person (the Soul) to a thing otherways without Life, Reason, Memory, or Free-will. But in the (pretended) Union of God with Man, there are Two distinct and very*

very different Lives, Memories, Reason, and Free-wills, which utterly destroys a Personal Union, for that supposes but One Life, One Reason, One Memory, One Free-will.

Now this is false as to matter of Fact: for though we will allow the Soul to be the Person, yet by its Union to the Body, it has two sorts of different Lives, Wills, Affections, Appetites, Reasons; the Animal and Sensual, and the Rational Life, Will, Appetites, a Carnal; and a Spiritual Reason, that is, two different Principles of Flesh and Spirit, as much as if every Man had two Souls.

So that there may be two Lives, two Wills, &c. in the same Person, and it makes no difference in this Case, whether these two Wills be seated in two different Subjects, or the same Soul by its vital Union to Matter, have two distinct Wills and Reasons; and therefore we must find out some other Notion of a Personal Union than this, *that one Person can have but one Will, one Reason, &c.* for it is plain, one Person may have two Wills and Reasons, and if he may have two, he may have three, according to the number and diversity of Natures, which are united into One Person.

Now when I inquire what it is that unites different Natures into One Person, I do not mean, what it is that naturally unites them; neither what the natural Union is between Soul and Body in the Person of Man, nor of God and Man in the Person of Christ, for this we know nothing of, and therefore no pretended Contradictions and Impossibilities in this, shall hinder my belief of it; as I discoursed in the first Section: But how two different Natures

may be so united, as to make but One Agent ; for One Agent is One Person.

Now there are but two things necessary to this :
 1. That these different Natures be so united , that the superior Nature have the Government of the whole Person ; unless there be One governing Principle, there cannot be One Agent , and therefore not One Person, and the superior Nature must be the Governour and the Person : as this Author tells us , the Soul is the Person in man ; as being the superior governing Principle ; and in the Soul , Reason has the natural government of Sense , as being the superior Faculty, proper to a Spirit , whereas Sense results from its Union to Matter : And thus in Christ, *the Divine Word* is the Person, and in this Personal Union of God and Man , has such a government of Humane Nature, as Reason has over Sense in Man : and therefore St. *John* tells us, That *the Word was made Flesh*, or was Incarnate : for the Person of the Word, took Humane Nature into a Personal Union with himself.

a John 14.

And this is the Reason , why all the Actions and Passions of Humane Nature are attributed to Christ, as the Son of God, because the Word is the Person , to whom Humane Nature is united ; and who has the sole government of it ; as all the Sufferings and Actions of the Body are attributed to the Man, though the Soul is the Person , because it is the superior and governing Power , and constitutes the Person.

2. To compleat a Personal Union, it is necessary there be One Consciousness in the whole : As a Man has a conscious Sensation of every thing, which is

is done or suffered either by Body or Soul ; feels its own Reasonings and Passions, and all the Pains and Pleasures of the Body; and in this Sense there must be but one Life in one Person, and this own Conscioufness to the whole, is the One Life.

But then we must observe , That where different Natures are united into One Person, this universal Conscioufness to the whole Person , is seated Only in the superior and governing Nature , as it ought to be ; because in that the Natures are united into One Person, and that must govern and take care of the whole. Thus the Mind in man is conscious to the whole man, and to all that is in man, to all the motions of Reason and Sense ; but Sense is not conscious to all the Actings of Reason, which is the superior Faculty, though it is conscious, as far as is necessary to receive the Commands and Directions of Reason ; for the Body moves at the command of the Will, and it is so far conscious to its Commands.

Thus in the Person of Christ, who is God-man, the Divine Word is conscious to his whole Person ; not only to himself, as the Divine Word, but to his whole Humane Nature ; not by such Knowledge as God knows all men, and all things , but by such a Conscioufness, as every Person has of himself. But it does not hence follow, that the Humane Nature is conscious to all that is in the Word ; for that destroys Humane Nature by making it Omniscient, which Humane Nature cannot be ; and its being united to the Person of the Word , does not require it should be ; for an inferior Nature is not conscious to all, that is in the superior Nature, in the same Person.

This.

This Union of Natures does require, that the inferior Nature be conscious to the superior, as far as its Nature is capable, and as far as the Personal Union requires; for so Sense is in some degree conscious to Reason, and it cannot be one Person without it. And therefore the Human Nature in Christ is in some measure, [in such a degree, as Human Nature can be,] conscious to the Word, feels its Union to God, and knows the Mind of the Word, not by External Revelations, as Prophets do, but by an Inward Sensation, as every man feels his own Thoughts and Reason; but yet the Human Nature of Christ may be ignorant of some things, notwithstanding its Personal Union to the Divine Word, because it is an inferior, and subject Nature. And this I take to be the true account of what our Saviour speaks about the Day of Judgment; *Of that day and hour knoweth no man, no nor the Angels in Heaven, but my Father only*: where our Saviour speaks of himself as a man; and as a man he did not at that time know the Day of Judgment, though personally united to the Divine Word, who did know it; for as he is the Divine Word, so our Saviour tells us, *That he seeth all that the Father doth*, and therefore what the Father knows, the Eternal Word and Wisdom of the Father must know also.

24 Matth. 36.

But yet the Human Nature of Christ was conscious to all the actings of the Divine Word in it; as we may see in the Story of the Woman, having an Issue of Blood twelve years, who in the midst of a great Crowd of People, came behind him, and touched his Garment, and was immediately healed; our Saviour presently asked who touched him, and when all denied it, and Peter wondered he should ask that Question,

Question, when the Multitude thronged him, and pressed him; *Jesus said, some body hath touched me,* 8 Luke 43, 46. *for I perceive that virtue is gone out of me;* he felt the miraculous Power of the Divine Word working in him, as a man feels what is done in himself.

This I think gives some account, how God and Man may be united into One Person, which though it be a great Mystery, which we cannot fully comprehend, yet is not wholly unintelligible, much less so absurd and contradictory, as this Author pretends.

As for what he adds about *believing and professing* this Faith, let him apply it to Christ's being the Messiah, or any other Article of the Creed, and see what Answer he will give to it; *for what if men can't believe it? are we obliged under the penalty of the loss of Salvation to believe it, whether we can or no? hath God require of any man an impossible Condition in order to Salvation?* No! but if it be credible, and what a wise man may believe, and what he has sufficient Evidence to believe, he shall be damned, not because he can't, but won't believe it.

But what if it be against a mans Conscience to profess it? ——— if he profess against his Conscience, he sins; and if notwithstanding this a man must either profess or be damned, then God requires some men to sin in order to their Salvation. God requires no man to profess against his Conscience, but he shall be damned for not believing it, not for not professing what he does not believe: it looks like a Judgment upon these men, that while they can talk of nothing less than the severest Reason, they impose

impose upon themselves, or hope to impose upon the World by the most Childish Sophistry and Non-sense.

And now I shall leave our Note-maker to harangue by himself, and persuade Fools, if he can, that the Doctrine of the Trinity and Incarnation is nothing but Popery, or must be parted with for the sake of *Jews*, or be made a Complement to the *Morocco* Ambassador, and his admired *Mahomet*; or must be sacrificed to Peace and Unity, and to secure men from damnation, who will not believe. I will not envy him the satisfaction of such Harangues, it being all the Comfort he has; for I am pretty confident he will never be able to Reason to any purpose in this Cause again.

Glory be to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost.

As it was in the beginning, is now, and ever shall be, World without end. Amen.

T H E E N D.

A D V E R T I S E M E N T.

A Preservative against Popery, in two Parts; with a Vindication, In Answer to the Cavils of *Lewis Sabran* a Jesuit. 4^o.

A Discourse concerning the Nature, Unity, and Communion of the Catholick Church. 4^o.

A Sermon Preached before the Lord Mayor, *Novemb. 4. 1688.* 4^o.

A Practical Discourse concerning Death. The Fifth Edition. 8^o.

The Case of the Allegiance due to Sovereign Powers, stated and resolved, according Scripture and Reason, and the Principles of the Church of *England*; with a more particular Respect to the Oath, lately enjoyed, of Allegiance to Their Present Majesties, *K. William and Q. Mary.* The Fifth Edition. 4^o.

By *William Shirlock*, D. D. Master of the Temple. Printed for *W. Rogers.*

